



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

THE
SCIENTIFIC VALUE OF TRADITION:

A Correspondence

BETWEEN

LORD ARUNDELL OF WARDOUR AND MR. E. RYLEY.

WITH A LETTER FROM THE

REV. H. FORMBY

ON

THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE OF TRADITION.



LONDON: PICKERING AND CO.

1879.

[All rights reserved.]

205. i. 226.

LONDON :
ROBSON AND SONS, PRINTERS, PANCRAE ROAD, N.W

PREFACE.

THE Letters which I venture to present to the public so fully disclose their own secret, that additional words in form of Preface would almost seem to be superfluous ; and moreover, as my correspondence with Mr. Ryley has continued intermittently during several years, it would be difficult to trace the stages through which the correspondence gradually expanded into dimensions which we thought might warrant a venture into the open sea. I must add, that I have taken this step in absolute reliance upon the mathematical precision of my correspondent's compass.

In the circumstances of the correspondence a certain resemblance will be detected to another correspondence published during the past year, under the title of *Proteus and Amadeus*.* This resemblance may possibly give rise to the impression that the present correspondence was suggested by the former. This really was not the case, as a comparison of dates will show. I feel bound to add, so far as I am personally concerned, that I suggest no resemblance in respect of the charm and elegance of style. Moreover, the former are written from a different point of view.

* *Proteus and Amadeus*, with an Introduction by Mr. Aubrey de Vere, 1878.

Since our correspondence went to the press the Rev. H. Formby has contributed a valuable letter to the short series now offered to the public, and has most usefully directed attention to the dissertations of the late Professor von Lasaulx and the works of Dr. Sepp. The intervention of the thoughtful and erudite author of *Monotheism the Primitive Religion of Rome*, and of *A Compendium of the Philosophy of Ancient History*, will, I do not doubt, be welcomed by the reader.

As the term, Science of Tradition, is, I believe, used in this correspondence for the first time,* I feel bound to

* In *Tradition, principally with Reference to Mythology, the Law of Nations* (Burns & Oates 1872, p. 118, 119), I wrote as follows: 'This inquiry might no doubt form a department either of scriptural exegesis, universal history, or of ethnological research; but, in point of fact, its scope is too large practically to fall within such limits; whereas, if it were recognised as a separate branch of study, it would, I venture to think, in the progress of its investigation, bring all these different branches of inquiry into harmony and completeness. And I further contend, that the conclusions thus attained are as well deserving of consideration as the conclusions of science from the implements of the drift, or as the evidence of "some bones, from the pliocene beds of St. Prest, which appear to show the marks of knives" (Sir J. Lubbock, Introduction to Nillson's *Stone Age*, xii.), which are adduced in evidence of a Palæolithic age. So that, when on one side it is said that science (meaning the science of geology or philology, &c.) has proved this or that fact apparently contrary to the scriptural narrative, it can, on the other hand, be asserted that the facts, or the inferences from them, are incompatible with the testimony of the science of tradition. The defenders of Scripture thus secure foothold on the ground of science, which, when properly intrenched, will stand good against the most formidable assaults of the enemy.'

'I cannot help thinking that some such thought lurks in the following passage of Cardinal Wiseman's *Second Lecture on Science and Revealed Religion* (fifth edition, p. 73): "Here again I cannot but regret our inability to comprehend in one glance the bearings and connections of different sciences; for, if it appears that ages must have been required

state at once that I only use the term comparatively—*i.e.* that we have as much right to speak of a science of tradition as Mr. Max Müller, for instance, has to speak of a science of religion.

I find in a recent work, *Education as a Science*, by Alexander Bain, LL.D., Professor of Logic in the University of Aberdeen (C. Kegan Paul, 1879, p. 148), the following classification of the sciences: ‘In reviewing the sciences in order, we may divide those relating to the outer world under these groups: Mathematics, as representing Abstract and Demonstrative Science; the Experimental Sciences—Physics, Chemistry, and Physiology; and the Sciences of Classification, commonly called Natural History. The Science of Mind will be taken apart.’

to bring languages to the state wherein we first find them, other researches would show us that these ages never existed; and we should thus be driven to discover some shaping power, some ever-ruling influence, which could do at once what nature would take centuries to effect; and the Book of Genesis hath alone solved this problem.”

‘No doubt a greater general acquaintance and power to grasp—or better still, an intuitive glance—with which to comprehend “the bearings and connections of different sciences,” would tend to circumscribe the aberrations of any particular science; but the special intervention which appears to me destined to bring the various sciences into harmony will be the elevation of the particular department of history or archaeology which has to do with the traditions of the human race as to its origin into a separate and recognised branch of inquiry; and I am satisfied that if any portion of that intellect which is cunning in the reconstruction of the mastodon, from its vertebral bone, had been directed to the great lines of human tradition, that enough of the “reliquiæ” and vestiges of the past remain to establish their conformity with that “which alone has solved this problem—the Book of Genesis;” and which, apart from the consideration of its inspiration, will ever remain the most venerable and best attested of human records.’

It seems to me that a much more simple classification would be, sciences which do, or which profess to, attain to metaphysical certainty; sciences which attain to mathematical certainty; and sciences which can arrive only at moral certainty; and it is in the latter category that we would place the Science of Tradition. I am prepared to allow that these sciences of moral evidence can only by courtesy be termed sciences;* but I shall have to contend, in the course of these Letters, that the sciences of Geology, Philology, Ethnology, &c., also come under this description, and stand on the same ground.

The reader is requested not to neglect the evidence in the Appendices.

* This was written previously to the publication of the *Month* for March 1879. *Vide* p. 374, 375.

WILLIAM PALMER, M.A.

In Memoriam.

ON the eve of publication I have read the sad announcement of the death of Mr. William Palmer, whose work, *Egyptian Chronicles*, will be frequently referred to in this Correspondence. I wish to say that, if in these references there is sometimes a shade of difference of opinion indicated, the argument was advanced, on my part, in the expectation that it would have encountered his keen and penetrating scrutiny, and, I may add, principally with a view of eliciting a further exposition of his theory.

It is to be hoped that his works will not be 'interred with him.' His valuable work on Egypt had a limited circulation, and after an interval his publishers informed him that it lay heavy on their shelves. He accordingly disposed of the whole edition at Messrs. Sotheby & Wilkinson's. I rarely see it crop up in any catalogue, and I apprehend there may be some danger of its dying out of existence altogether. I believe he was engaged until within a few days of his death upon a Latin summary of this work.

It occasionally happens that the works of an author,

which have been undervalued during his lifetime, begin to be understood and appreciated after his death :

‘ Seven cities proud contend for Homer dead,
Through which the living Homer begged his bread.’

Of course Mr. Palmer was under no such necessity; but it is not bread alone that an author seeks or—as in the case of Mr. Palmer it may perhaps be said—demands at the hands of the public. This posthumous fame cannot be very satisfactory to the author in the anticipation, and is unfortunate for the public, as the living voice is no longer there to interpret. If there ever was a man who laboured devotedly, assiduously, and disinterestedly for posterity, it was Mr. Palmer. His greatest labour, *The Patriarch and the Tsar*, which will remain incomplete, in six large octavo volumes of some 600 pages each, must have cost him an infinitude of trouble and expense, and without any prospect of return. Mr. Palmer always appeared to me to regard in his thoughts a very remote posterity, unmindful of a concurrence of prophecy which limits the duration of the world to another 120 years. Whether this was Mr. Palmer’s own view, I cannot say; but among Mr. Palmer’s works—to which no allusion has been made in the notices I have seen—was a commentary on Daniel, *Commentatio in Librum Danielis Prophetæ* (Romæ, 1874).

The work above referred to, *The Patriarch and the Tsar*, will illustrate my meaning. It contains indeed much that will attract any reader who is interested in Russia and the Russian Church; but, in the main, its intention was to preserve the unique and important

Russian documents in his possession in translation, in the hope that, under some altered political conditions, they might be eventually re-translated back again into Russian.

'9

Mr. William Palmer was the elder brother of Lord Selborne. He was born at Mixbury Rectory, Oxfordshire, July 12, 1811; was received into the Catholic Church 1856; and died at Rome, April 5, 1879.

A.

The Scientific Value of Tradition.

I.

DEAR RYLEY,

May 11, 1877.

In your indulgent criticism in the *Westminster Gazette* you invite me to restate my proposal for the foundation and recognition of a specific science of Tradition, with something more of lucidity in arrangement than is found in the pages of the book you review. I shall attempt this, at any rate, as regards one part of the argument; and in doing so I feel greatly sustained by the chronological argument which you address to the Progressionists, viz.

‘Three thousand years is about the thirteenth part of say forty thousand odd years, the time assigned by the Egyptian chronicles, the last strong refuge of the believers in anything except sacred records, from the commencement of authentic history to the present times. Well, according to this theory, we should expect that the statesmen, lawgivers, soldiers, and philosophers of our time would show something, say a thirteenth, more of cultivated genius than the men of old, of whom we know something independently of the sacred narrative. . . .’

The ingenuity of this argument will perhaps tend to detract from its force, but to my mind it is very strong; for however much the Evolutionists may postulate the

indefinite lapse of centuries for the slightest progress, they ought, as I think Elam points out, and more especially upon Darwinian lines, to show some actual progress in the organisation and constitution of man, however slight, of which we can take cognisance; but although knowledge and experience have accumulated, and progress may be seen in the external circumstances surrounding mankind, yet so far as intellect and *physique* are concerned the men of old, as you justly assert, were at least equal to the men of the present day.

I do not suppose they will reply to your argument any more than they met Mr. William Palmer's (*Egyptian Chronicles*), who brought the Scriptures to a synchronism of within 'five years four months' and some days of the Egyptian computation. Every argument, however, which brings their assumption of progress to a *reductio ad absurdum* logically compels the Evolutionists to face the direct evidence; and my object in writing to you now is to show that the direct historical evidence is much stronger than I think it is generally believed to be even by believers in scriptural inspiration.

Moreover, in the book you reviewed (*Tradition, &c.*) I attempted to show that a scientific basis might be obtained by collating the indirect with the direct evidence, for I know no other basis of science than the basis of ascertained fact; and I think this may gain some additional illustration in the suggestions I shall venture to make.

I must first premise that since the publication of my book I have become acquainted (in the French translation from the German) with the excellent and valuable work of M. Henri Luken, *Les Traditions de l'Humanité*.* I find

* As, in your review, you speak of my suggestion as 'a just and original thought,' I have felt bound to reconsider the matter from that point of view. The work of M. Luken was first brought to my knowledge (after

he also says, in his preface, 'A profound examination . . . has convinced us that these traditions are much more numerous and general among the Pagan nations than is commonly supposed. . . . The comparative study of lan-

the publication of *Tradition*, &c., in Feb. 1872) in a letter from a friend (Mr. T. W. Allies), June 7, 1872. If I had been acquainted with this very able and comprehensive work, or with the work of Sepp, I should have constructed, if I may be allowed the expression, an entirely different plan of campaign. As matters stand, we shall be found, according to our respective degrees, supplemental to each other; for although often apparently on the same lines, we shall hardly be found to touch at any point.

In *Tradition*, p. xii., I have referred to the late Colonel G. Macdonell, C.B. My attention has also, since the publication of *Tradition*, been called to a letter of the Earl of Lindsay's in Dr. Forbes's (Bishop of Brechin) *Explanation of the Nicene Creed*, 1866, p. 173, in which the following passage occurs: 'It has for a long time been in my thoughts that it would be possible to reconstruct "the Creed of Japhet," the primitive religious belief of the Aryan race, assigning to it whatever is pure, holy, and of good report, and conformable to the idea of God, as witnessed by natural religion in the mythical traditions of Aryan antiquity; and separating from it whatever is corrupt and unclean, as necessarily of later growth and accretion: this inquiry to be prosecuted in entire independence of the Bible and of Revelation, and the materials to be sought for partly in the traditions of mythology, and partly in the utterances of etymology and linguistic science. . . .'

In case my book were to go to a second edition, I should have to note also a coincidence—it would not have been more, for my book was written, and, I think, in the press, at that date—in a remark made by the Rev. Joseph Rickaby, M.A., in an article in the *Month* (May and June, 1871), on Jowett's Plato, p. 332, where, quoting Jowett to the effect that 'utility is not the historical basis of morality, nor the aspect in which moral and religious ideas commonly occur to the mind,' Mr. Rickaby adds, 'Here is vantage-ground for an anti-utilitarian;' a very pregnant remark.

Such coincidences of thought seem constantly to occur, and I hope I may be forgiven for feeling some consolation that such misfortunes happen also 'to our brethren who are in the world.' Thus, I find Mr. Darwin, in his *Climbing Plants* (Murray, 1875), says: 'My observations were more than half completed before I learnt that the surprising phenomena of the spontaneous revolutions of the stems and tendrils of climbing plants had been long ago observed by Pahn and Hugo Von Mohl, and subsequently been the subject of two memoirs by Dutrochet.' I do not know whether the feeling of individuality remains the same in the Darwinian system; but if 'a touch of nature' still 'makes the whole world kin' (they cannot account for Shakespeare, as you say, but I have not heard of their discarding him), perhaps Mr. Darwin will condescend to join hands with me and with Donatus in exclaiming, 'Periant qui ante nos, nostra dixerunt.'

guages has already produced astonishing results; why should not a comparative study of the most ancient traditions of the world (*des peuples*) . . . be permitted to expose the relations of Paganism with primitive revelation? The success surpassed our expectations.' He adds that Lassaulx and Sepp had previously regarded these traditions from the same point of view, although they had taken a different route.

I also, at the commencement of chapter vii. of *Tradition, &c.*, gave quotations from Lacordaire, Nicolas, and F. Paley, and in chapter vi. from Mr. W. Palmer, in the same sense, at any rate in recognition of the scientific value they implicitly attached to these traditions as evidences of the truth; and I have elsewhere incidentally referred to De Maistre, F. Schlegel, Calmet, Boulanger, Gainet, Bryant, Faber, Davies, &c., who have adduced similar testimony from their own respective points of view. Indeed, all these writers have approached the question from different directions, and have in this way gone over different ground; and thus a large body of evidence exists, although scattered and dispersed.

Now I have ventured to go a step farther, and suggest that if this mass of evidence could be brought under our view, or sifted into classification by competent men working together or in concert, as happens to be possible in the geological and philological departments of science, certain facts would come to be absolutely recognised which would give as sound *pied-à-terre* as the facts of geology or the conclusions of philology.

The array of names which I have given—and the list is by no means exhaustive—sufficiently establish that a considerable number of eminent writers have fully seen the bearing of these traditions, and the important attestation they bring to the truth (when impugned) of the scriptural narrative.

I am at a loss, therefore, to understand how an intelligent Catholic can write as follows: * 'It appears to us mere trifling to place passages from Ovid's *Metamorphoses* in apposition with statements from the first chapter of Genesis, as if the Mosaic account of the Creation and the Deluge could be strengthened in any available degree by the imaginative utterances of an amatory Roman poet. The parallel is interesting, of course, in a literary point of view, but in a scientific one it has no value at all. The same remark applies to the traditions in Plutarch, Berosus, and Lucian about Deucalion and the dove.'

If the remark equally applies to the traditions of Deucalion and the dove, we must presume that it would equally apply to Ovid, if the passages from the *Metamorphoses* were traditions, and not the 'imaginative utterances of an amatory Roman poet;' and we must take it that it equally applies to the traditions in Plutarch, Berosus, and Lucian, *i.e.* equally to the tradition in Berosus as to the traditions in Plutarch and Lucian.

Now I could understand the view that the utterances of Ovid were imaginative and not traditional, although we might not succumb to the opinion. [Ovid has resemblances to Genesis just as Hesiod has; and it is more possible in his case than in Hesiod's that he may have seen the Hebrew or Septuagint text; yet if the tradition is *aliunde* proved to have been widely diffused, there is at least an equal presumption that he drew from other sources.] I could further understand that, in the absence of a science of tradition, it might be loosely asserted that the date at which Plutarch and Lucian lived placed them out of court; but if such a science existed, it would have methods of its own for distinguishing true from

* As this passage may not express the full and deliberate thought of the writer, I do not consider it necessary to make any precise reference; but I take advantage of it as a text, since it gives expression to a sort of criticism which is not uncommon, although rarely tangible.

spurious traditions, and would decide by the internal evidence, and its analogy with older traditions, that the statement of Lucian at any rate was traditional. What, however, I am at a loss to understand is, that if the legends of Deucalion and the dove are established as traditions, how a Catholic writer can fail to see the strength and force of their testimony against the Darwinian position, or how he can argue that as traditions they have no scientific value. Can Darwin be allowed to ignore the fact; or if Darwin be privileged to go his own way, then can the disciples of Darwin, who practically apply his theory, ignore the fact that there is historical record of traditions of a totally different origin of the human race than that for which they contend? True, they may adduce some traditions which *primâ facie* point the other way; but then they must condescend to come down to the ground of tradition, where they ought to find a science ready to confront them. If, however, the direct testimony of human history and the indirect evidence of tradition, when it is not also direct, emphatically pronounce for our theory (revelation apart), is it to be allowed that the disciples of the 'philosophy of progress' are to set this evidence aside on the ground that the order of facts is of a different order of certainty from that which they call scientific, and upon which they rely? Is historical certainty less certain than the certainty of scientific observation? Are they not both in analysis different forms of moral certainty? Is it less certain that William the Conqueror lived, and that Queen Anne is dead, than that flint implements were discovered in the valley of the Somme along with the remains of the mammoth and the woolly rhinoceros? In the same way, are the records of traditions at certain dates less reliable and less available for the purposes of argument than the records of the relations of geological discoveries? And to come to the point

to which I have been drifting, is it less certain that Berosus (B.C. 330-260) recorded the traditional belief of the Babylonians in a universal Deluge than that about twenty years ago a fragment of a human skull, of a period undetermined, was found in the cave of Neandenthal?

Now undoubtedly until recently the authority of Berosus has been held in light esteem. It must, moreover, be remarked that the accounts we have of what Berosus said are traditional and fragmentary, coming to us at secondhand, through Alexander Polyhistor, Abydenus, and others. Berosus' account also lay under the suspicion of being only the Hebrew account at secondhand, as he lived at Babylon subsequently to the Jewish Babylonian Captivity.

But this tradition of Berosus has now quite recently, through the discoveries of the late lamented Mr. George Smith, become history.

Not only has tradition received a startling confirmation, but the whole evidence stands on altogether different ground, and, it seems to me, confirms the biblical history in a more absolute manner than, I think, has yet been pointed out.

For the justification of this assertion I stipulate only that the identity of Izdubar of the cuneiform (Deluge) tablet with the Nimrod of the Bible is conceded. For me it will always remain a strong inducement to belief that the late Mr. George Smith thought it established. He says (*Chaldean Account of Genesis*, p. 167): 'The Izdubar legends give, I believe, the history of the biblical hero Nimrod. They record the adventures of a famous sovereign of Babylonia, whom I provisionally call Izdubar, but whose name cannot at present be phonetically rendered.' At p. 182: 'My own conviction is, however, that when the phonetic reading of the characters is found, it will turn out to correspond with the name Nimrod.' He

adds, 'I have already evidence for applying this reading to the characters.' He notes that he 'is the centre of the national historical poetry, and was the hero of Babylonian cuneiform history, just as Nimrod is stated to have been in the later traditions.' 'I subsequently found that he agreed exactly in character with Nimrod; he was a giant hunter, according to the cuneiform legends, who contended with and destroyed the lion, tiger, leopard, and wild bull or buffalo. . . . He ruled first in Babylonia, over the region which, from other sources, we know to have been the centre of Nimrod's kingdom. He extended his dominion to the Armenian mountains, the boundary of his later conquests, according to tradition; and one principal scene of his exploits and triumphs was Erech, which, according to Genesis, was the second capital of Nimrod.'

Further evidence might be adduced. The most favoured opposition theory is that Izdubar is the Sun-god. But as Mr. Goldziher (*Mythology of the Hebrews*) has quite recently demonstrated to his own satisfaction that all the biblical heroes, from Noah to Samson, are Sun-gods, this asseveration, in the case of Izdubar, may even incline some minds the more to the belief that he may be Nimrod. All is no doubt open to contention or reversal; but if it is admitted by a believer in divine revelation, or even by a believer in the intrinsic historical evidence of the Bible, then I have only to point out that Nimrod was the son of Chus [Mr. George Smith, by the bye, thinks that his Izdubar's father's name can be read 'Kusu' in the cuneiform inscriptions], and Chus the son of Cham, and Cham or Ham the son of Noah. Thus the scriptural narrative will have received absolute confirmation at a point within two generations of Noah and the second commencement of the race.

It will still be true that the links between Assur-

banipal and Nimrod will remain to be discovered;* but given the point, Nimrod, so to speak, and the fact of the transmission of the legends concerning him, there is a sort of certainty, according to the 'historical instinct,' that the hero of the legend (he, if not resolved into a solar hero, being an undoubted sovereign of 'Babylon' and 'Erech') stood in the relation of not very remote ancestry, real or presumed, to the monarchs who preserved the legends so carefully among their records. It is conceivable, for instance, that there should have been a succession of dynasties, even alien dynasties, yet, on grounds of policy, careful to connect themselves with this proto-sovereign. It is scarcely conceivable that there should have been a succession of republics. It is not conceivable at all that there should have been an intermediate period of barbarism; the preservation of the record, at any rate the transmission of the legend, of Izdubar or Nimrod being an admitted fact. Moreover, the double preservation of the record (the existing tablets being only copies of older ones) being also an admitted fact,† there is no room for the lapse of time necessary for degeneracy into savagery, and the progress out of it, within the interval.

For on this matter we are not left purely to conjecture. No; given the identity of Izdubar and Nimrod, it must be remembered that the Scriptures give the parallel generations from Shem through Nachor to Abraham, with historical connection from Abraham to Moses and from Moses to David, from whom we have the genealogical descent historically recorded. [The Rev. W. Smith, in his learned work, *The Pentateuch*—the first volume only has

* *Vide* Supplement to this letter.

† 'The texts of Rim-aga, Sargon, and Hammurabi, who were one thousand years before Nebuchadnezzar and Nabonidus, show the same language as the text of these later kings. . . .' G. Smith, *Chaldean Account of Genesis*, p. 23.

been printed in 1868—proves demonstrably how Exodus proves Genesis, and Leviticus Exodus, &c.]

The conclusion I draw is, that the history and chronology of the world can be determined through two concurrent channels, both leading up to the common catastrophe of a universal Deluge.

It may be well to remind my readers that no suggestion or solution on the difficulty of degeneracy into, or emergence from, barbarism would be acceptable to the modern 'philosophers of progress,' which was not in thousands or millions of years.

With this foundation laid—and the argument, I think, must have a certain cogency even for those who reject revelation—I will now indicate my view as to the reduction of these traditions to a science.

I. Assuming, then, that the identity of these traditions must bring the histories of the Hebrew and Chaldean peoples into unity at the point of the universal Deluge, to which they both testify, we shall, on the same grounds, the evidence being independent, be entitled to aggregate to them all other nations whose traditions also testify to a universal Deluge.

Now it can be shown that the Aryans, Greeks, Chinese, &c., have this tradition recorded in their literature in a manner which is not open to the suspicion of invention or introduction.

If there is dispute on these points, it is just one of the questions which ought to be brought under the cognisance of the science of tradition, and for which the indications of tradition would give peculiar facilities. As matters stand, these questions are decided entirely on grounds of philology.

As an instance in point, from the moment this department of science marked out its ground, it would be no

longer possible to object, *in limine*, the forgeries palmed off upon Lieutenant Wilford, against those who seek testimonies in the Vedas. I have always worked in wariness of that quagmire; but a certain miasma of suspicion will always arise from it, until there is a centre of appeal, *i.e.* until a science is constituted. From that moment it will be fully recognised that the corruption has not touched any documents upon which reliance is placed.

I must, moreover, observe that the suspicion of the intercommunication of the main lines of the tradition of the Deluge can only be raised on the assumption that there never was a universal Deluge; for, on the contrary supposition, the presumption of some remembrance of the calamity in the successors of the survivors would be very strong indeed. The simple marking out of scientific ground would again make such a *petitio principii* impossible in the future.

II. A second group might be affiliated to the former composed of those nations who have, or who can be proved by the testimony of travellers of the last or previous generations to have had, a tradition of the universal Deluge, or such a tradition of a partial Deluge as showed it to be only a localised or fragmentary tradition of the former. Such traditions are very widely dispersed.

III. There would lie outside this group nations whose literature or traditions, so far as is known, do not directly testify to the Deluge, but who have other traditions which would involve or presuppose this lost tradition, *e.g.* traditions of Paradise, or Adam and Eve, Cain and Abel, or the Giants.

IV. There are tribes whose laws, usages, even fetish customs, testify in some way or other to a common origin with one or other of the above groups.

Thus a sufficiently diligent search, which could hardly

be undertaken by one individual,* would, I think, by an exhaustive process, bring most of the nations of the world into these lines.

I conclude with a remark which may sound like a truism, but which it will be very necessary to reiterate in these inquiries. The history of Adam and Eve was not revealed to us by the Bible; the episode of Cain and Abel was not made known to Moses at the moment when he wrote Genesis. The Deluge, in fine, was not a catastrophe remembered only by the Hebrew people. These, and the other events of primeval history, were the common heritage and common tradition of all mankind. The Bible has given us the divinely guarded, and in part also the divinely inspired, narrative of these events.

Yours very sincerely,

ARUNDELL OF WARDOUR.

* I have referred, p. 10, to various works bearing on the subject of tradition written previously to the publication of my book (1872). The following works, published since, will be found to contain valuable additional matter in similar testimony: *Gentilism, Religion previous to Christianity*, by the Rev. Aug. J. Thebaud, S.J. (Sadleir, Barclay-street, New York, 1876). *Monotheism, the Primitive Religion of Rome*, by the Rev. H. Formby (Williams & Norgate, 1877). *Vestiges des Principaux Dogmes Chrétiens tirés des Anciens Chinois*, par le Père de Premare, S.J. (ed. Bonnetty, Paris, 1878). *De Ecclesia et Cathedrâ*, by the Hon. Colin Lindsay (Longmans, 1877). *The Recent Origin of Man*, by James C. Southall (Philadelphia, and Trübner, London, 1875). Also—with reference to the counter theory of evolution—*The Genesis of Species*, by St. George Mivart (1871), and other works; Dr. Charles Elam's *Winds of Doctrines* (Smith, Elder, 1876); and Amadeus's letters to Proteus, *Proteus and Amadeus*, edited by Mr. Aubrey de Vere (C. Kegan Paul, 1878). I add, although I have not yet read it, *La Bible et les Découvertes Modernes en Egypte et en Assyrie*, par F. Vigouroux, prêtre de S. Sulpice, Paris.

SUPPLEMENT TO LETTER I. (NOTE, p. 15).

At the moment of publication I have read, as reported in the *Times*, Oct. 5, 1878, Canon Tristram's paper (at the sitting of the Church Congress), whose conclusion on this point is the reverse of mine. With the substance of Canon Tristram's remarks I entirely agree, and should wish to transcribe them *in extenso*. He says, 'From Nimrod or Izdubar downwards, the chronology now stands scarcely disputed,' but 'in the antecedent period, from the Flood to his date, we must frankly admit many difficulties. . . . We can scarcely conceive so vast a multiplication of mankind in the space of three generations, even if we compress the whole into the valleys of the Euphrates and Tigris, as is evidenced in the history and works of Nimrod.' He considers that 'succession, not chronology, is the object of the narrative,' which is true, but adds that 'the statement that Cush was the son of Ham, and Nimrod the son of Cush, need bear no closer interpretation than that Nimrod was descended from Ham through Cush,' upon the analogy of St. Matthew i. This does away with the succession as well as the chronology; whereas St. Matthew, when he says our Lord was 'son of David, the son of Abraham,' proceeds at once to supply the links of the succession. Genesis does the same. It is not merely said that Nimrod was son of Chus (or Cush), and Chus the son of Ham, leaving the sense open whether he was the son or descendant of Ham, but Chus is specifically referred to as one of four sons of Ham, whose names are given, and all of whom are pretty well located and historically accounted for; at any rate,

Canon Tristram will probably not dispute with me as to the descendants of Misraim and Canaan. If the argument does not hold as between Ham and Chus, it can hardly be insisted upon as between Chus and Nimrod. It must be noted that the birth of Nimrod is mentioned in a separate paragraph, and after the birth of the other five sons of Chus, as if at much later date. Looking to the evidence of the monuments and tablets, I find nothing to indicate any 'vast multiplication of mankind.' All the circumstances and surroundings which would accord with the literal interpretation accompany the history of Izdubar, whom we both agree to be Nimrod. Izdubar is not like the later Babylonian monarchs, represented as conquering by his armies, but by his strong hand. He is (*Chaldean Account of Genesis*, p. 174) 'a giant who gained dominion in Babylonia.' He prevails in single combat, slaying the tyrant Humbaba, with the assistance of his companion Heabani. In the first tablet of the series many grand phrases are used, in respect to a three years' siege of Erech, but the affair, in Mr. G. Smith's opinion, had to do 'with a tribe who held Erech for a short time, and were driven out by Izdubar; . . . in fact it appears that Izdubar did not assume the crown until long after the events recorded on this tablet. . . . The whole of the Euphrates valley was at this time divided into petty kingdoms, and Izdubar by his prowess established a dominion over many of these, making thus the first empire in Asia.' This accords with the indications given elsewhere by Mr. G. Smith, *e.g.* p. 26: 'We cannot fix the dates of any monuments before the time of Uruk, B.C. 2000;' p. 25, 'down to B.C. 2000, epoch of independent kingdoms in Babylonia.' If, on the other hand, we take the evidence of Genesis, ch. xiv., we find much the same state of things subsisting in the time of Abraham 1000 years after the Flood: we find him defeating an invading force of what would seem petty independent kings

(the names of two, I believe, identified with the monuments) with 318 men. The great difficulty for Canon Tristram, and for us all, if they exist, are 'the thirty-six successive kings preceding Nimrod.' The number thirty-six does not appear to be a misprint, as Canon Tristram gravely attempts to compress them into a thousand years; but where does he find them? They can only be 'the *eighty-six* Chaldean kings who reigned from the Flood down to the Median conquest, 34,080 or 33,091 years' (list of Berosus, in *Chaldean Account of Genesis*, p. 186). If Canon Tristram takes these kings he must take them with their 34,000 years. Now the next term to the 'sar' in the Chaldean system of computation would be 36,000, and there has been more than one theory (*e.g.* M. Gutschmid, *vide* Canon Rawlinson's *Ancient Monarchies*, i. p. 192, and Dr. Brandis, *vide* Mr. W. Palmer's *Egyptian Chronicles*, ii. p. 991) which has collected these dynasties into one of these periods; thus, if these conjectures are correct, proving them to be mythical. Mythical they must be, or scriptural chronology must lose itself, as some rivers in the East lose themselves in a desert of sand; and thus the testimony of Canon Tristram would appear to contradict that of Canon Rawlinson, the previous speaker, who had justly said, 'The whole system of literal historical interpretation always upheld by the Church, and not even really set aside by Origen, had been reëstablished, and was now almost unquestioned.' Mr. W. Palmer (*Egyptian Chronicles*, ii. p. 992) objects to the theory of the 'sar' above referred to, on the ground that 'it is merely a great sum obtained by multiplying one number into another,' and that it is not cyclical; 'for though 36,500 Canicular, or Julian, or 36,525 vague Nabonassarian years are cyclical numbers representing twenty-five Sothic cycles, 36,000 is not.' I would venture to say, however, that what may be predicated of the multiple 432,000 may be predicated of

its constituent part 36,000. Now 432,000, the figure to which Berosus extends his chronology, is common to the Chaldean and Indian systems, and is resolvable into sars and neroses. The Sothic cycle, although probably known to, and possibly employed by, Berosus, would have its cyclical significance only for Egypt. Mr. Palmer, however, upon his own system, brings the chronologies of Babylon and Egypt into very close approximation, *vide infra*. I am now merely drawing attention to the fact that more theories than one would appear to have shown these figures to be mythical, and, if they do not solve the problem, seem to indicate the method of solution. I have not, as yet, seen any attempt to refute Mr. Palmer's theory of Egyptian chronology; and if that is allowed to stand, it makes his solution of the Babylonian very probable.

I do not remember to have seen the Babylonian chronology, as given by Berosus, and the Egyptian chronology, as we find it in 'the Old Chronicle,' placed in juxtaposition; and it seems to me only necessary to so place them in order that it may be apparent that they are on the same mythical lines. If I quote from 'the Old Chronicle,' I do so in reliance upon Mr. Palmer's decision that it is the Old Chronicle (*vide Tradition, &c.*, p. 95); that, in Mr. Palmer's words, 'it really is, and they, from whom we have it (Syncellus and Africanus), tell us it was, the oldest Egyptian writing of the kind current in the time of Africanus.'

BEROSUS' LIST.

'Eighty-six Chaldean kings reigned from the Flood down to the Median conquest, 34,080 or 33,091 years.

Eight Median kings, who conquered and held Babylon 234 or 224 or 190 years.

Eleven other kings, race and

OLD CHRONICLE

(Abbreviated from Mr. Palmer's *Egyptian Chronicles*, i. p. 7).

Time of Phtha there is none, as he shines equally by night and by day.

"Ἡλως son of Phtha reigned three myriads of years—30,000 years.



duration unknown. [Mr. G. Smith places Izdubar or Nimrod at the head of these eleven kings.] . . . From G. Smith's *Chaldean Account of Genesis*, p. 186.

Then Kεροε; and all the other twelve gods reigned 3984 years.

Then eight demigod kings reigned 217 years.

And after them fifteen generations of the Cynic cycle were registered in years 443.

Then Dynasty xvi. of Tanites, generations eight, years 190.

Then Dynasty xvii. of Memphites, generations four, years of the same generations, 103. After whom there followed Dynasty xviii. of Memphites, &c.

With the Dynasty xviii. it is admitted on all sides that contemporary dynasties ceased; and, on the other hand, the eleven Babylonian kings commence with Nimrod. If we thus draw the line at what we may term the historical period, and add the figures at that point, we find the difference between the two chronologies to be 103 (taking 224 as the medium figure of the three mentioned for the eight Median kings corresponding to the eight demigods in the Egyptian).

CHALDEAN.	EGYPTIAN.
34,080	30,000
224	3,984
<hr/> 34,304	<hr/> 217
	<hr/> 34,201
34,304	
<hr/> 34,201	
103	

The figures I have excluded on the Egyptian side down to the historical period are 443, 190, 103. The 443 are called years 'of the Cynic cycle,' and are manifestly mythical; concerning which, *vide* Mr. Palmer's *Egyptian Chronicles*, vol. i. In *Tradition*, &c., ch. vi., I have attempted to give a synopsis of Mr. Palmer's argument. The other

figures, 190 and 103, will be noticed in both chronologies: in the Egyptian, among the years allotted to the dynasties; and in the Babylonian, 103, as the difference between it and the Egyptian, and 190 as one of the figures mentioned (viz. '234 or 224 or 190') for the eight Median kings.

If, as the difference between 234 and 224 is so slight, we might conjecture these figures to refer to the same dynasty or reigns; and 190, as bearing no resemblance, to be some transferred or extraneous figure—a figure to be added; and if we add it accordingly, we shall have 190 to set off against the 190 years of the Egyptian dynasty of Tanites, and the difference will still be 103: the same figure as the figure for the years of the last Egyptian dynasty remaining unaccounted for previous to the historical period in the Egyptian list, viz. the seventeen Memphites, 103 years.

Mr. Palmer seems to demonstrate that 'Kronos and all the other twelve gods,' and 'the eight demigod kings,' were the antediluvian and postdiluvian patriarchs and ancestors, in which case the numbers 190, 103, may have been years transferred from their reigns, and may thus have become common to the two chronologies.

II.

Hackney, July 4, 1877.


DEAR ARUNDELL,

If you attribute any force to the objection I put forward in the very brief and inadequate review of your book on Tradition in the *Westminster Gazette* as against the Progressionists, it strikes me that you must, and very justly, attach capital importance, as in fact you appear to do, to the chronological question; I mean, to the chronology of the human race apart from that of the universe, except man. For if 3000 is such a number of years compared with 40,000 (I adopt round numbers), that if a theory of the progressive advance of man to civilisation through barbarism from original savagery is propounded, it is an objection to it of some force that we do not see any proportionate advance exhibited within 3000 years, the objection becomes well-nigh fatal if 40,000 years be reduced to the more moderate number established by Mr. Palmer from the evidence of the records on which the Progressionists relied for establishing the larger number.

But the neo-philosophers, granting them to be philosophers with such a qualification, and the naturalists of the day, with honourable exceptions however, will not grant us so distinguished a descent through countless ages as one from primeval savagery. They eagerly, unreasonably, and fanatically build on fanciful analogies a theory of the descent of man, and the progress of the race, which is received amongst them almost as an article of faith, whose chief recommendation to those who adopt it seems to be that it invalidates the sacred narrative. None who receive it demand such direct and palpable evidence as would be producible if man were really not created, but evolved out

of lower forms of existence. No one is able, by contemporary examples, the revelations of geology, or the monuments of history, to produce examples which bridge over the wide gulf which separates the lowest form of savagery in man from the highest form of intelligence in brute. I contend that, on the theory of evolution, and the production of different races of men by parallel lines of evolution, we are entitled to demand *existing* examples of all the steps or stages of advance. We ought *now* to see something very near to man, which is not man, and to see what is truly man, but with difficulty distinguishable as man. In place of this we find the gulf I spoke of so wide that, if we take the test of reasonable language only, there can be no possible doubt between 'man' in the lowest known state of savagery and 'irrational animal' in the highest state of educated intelligence. I have a recollection of this test of reasonable language having been put forward by Mr. Huxley.

But, if by any evidence it can be shown that the road which has led that part of the world which is now deepest below the civilised part of it in barbarism has lain through a descent from a previous state of civilisation, we have another and independent argument against continuous progress upwards through countless ages. It is here, by another and independent line, that the science of tradition comes in to examine and compare the existing indications of past facts in the history of man embalmed in a corrupted tradition, with like indications, perhaps equally but diversely corrupted, but widely dispersed, and with the more stable records or monuments of history. On this point I was greatly struck with a passage in your paper, 'Nigra sed formosa,' quoted in my review in the *Westminster Gazette*. 'I will concede,' you wrote, 'that with time the traditions may have become as well worn and fragmentary as the gravel and sand in the river-bed; but,



I ask, will not the geologist take up a handful of this sediment, and from an examination of this gravel and sand tell you what has been the course of the stream, what its early commencement, the rocks which it has disintegrated, and the crags amidst which it found its source? Past events leave relics behind them more certainly than future events cast shadows before them; and the science of tradition will as certainly proceed from such imperfect, scattered, and fragmentary relics to reconstruct, so to speak, the events, as the anatomical naturalist will reproduce the construction of an entire extinct animal organisation from a few fossilised bones. I think it is a truth which may be assumed as an axiom, that as time does not destroy the material of the granite rock or of the gold-bearing quartz, so also it does not destroy the past facts in the history of the human race. But that, adopting your analogy, the past has certainly left imperishable traditions, which, if we were to collect, analyse, and compare them, would enable us to reconstruct the events; more especially if we have otherwise at hand historical records with which to compare the indications of traditions, and see the like or congruous events passing before our eyes. Thus the disintegrated rocks which form the gravel or sand of the bed of the river or of the seashore are more manifestly disintegrated rocks, since we can point to the like rocks now in existence, and to specimens before our eyes of the process by which these rocks were disintegrated. So in aid of the science of tradition we have durable records, whether in ancient inscriptions, in the literature of various nations, or—humbly begging pardon of the new philosophers, or rather scientists—in the Sacred Scriptures, of those very events which are found in a confused and fragmentary state in tradition; and, finally, we see in these later ages the like events passing before our eyes.

Customs, traditions, the records and monuments of

history, and existing events are to be collected and collated. This, as I understand you, is the science of tradition. You have already applied this science to establish the unity of the human race from the evidence of a universal Deluge, and the 'survival' of Noah and his family, and the divine origin of the Law of Nations from its universal acceptance as obligatory. I trust, and do not at all doubt, that you and others will carry it further, and that wider ranges of observation, and more fully instructed observers, will produce the facts necessary for a larger application of the science whose foundations you propose. And indeed, this is sure to follow the recognition of the fact that tradition, like geology or ethnology, is a science with its own special scope and methods.

But the novelty of this idea, which gives value to what would otherwise appear to be scientifically useless or even mischievous, prevents my sharing your surprise that an intelligent Catholic writer should think it trifling, at the very least, to use passages from Ovid's *Metamorphoses* to strengthen the Mosaic account of the Creation. He was probably scandalised at the idea of its requiring any strengthening; and did not advert to the fact that it does require strengthening to those who deny its divine inspiration, or who, admitting this, adopt a new reading of what have been received as the historical facts recorded. Like many other intelligent Catholics the critic in question had not received and assimilated the idea of a science of tradition in which all records, whether found in customary observances or in the verses of an amatory poet, or however otherwise preserved, are to be collected, and, so to speak, appraised as facts within the scope of the science.

We cannot have too much of science. The more we have of it, the more shall we confound the rash but plausible theories, built, by means of fanciful analogies

and unscientific generalisations, on the limited range of one branch of science, especially when this is cultivated by men who ignore theology—the greatest and most certain of all sciences—and have not even graduated in philosophy, without which the minds of ingenious observers become narrow and visionary. Let the scope of the scientists become wide enough, and they will become philosophers.

It is, I think, observable that those who take up some laborious and interesting specialty, without the advantage of such preliminary and wider study as enables them fairly to appreciate the facts they are concerned with, and to collate them with what is established by other branches of investigation and science, seem to acquire and exhibit very patently an unscientific confidence in the very ingenious conclusions they draw from such facts as they too exclusively contemplate, founding on them plausible theories, in ignorance or contempt of conclusions deducible, and long since deduced, from other facts, which have been the study of the greatest and most cultivated minds amongst our predecessors. If to this be added a fanatical desire to eliminate God from the universe, and to worship their own special theories in His stead, need we wonder that they go somewhat astray from the paths of reason, philosophy, and theology? The newest 'discovery,' or rather, the latest guess, is the most wonderful of all, and the proofs are as irrefragable as the discovery is wonderful. If proof be absolutely wanting, the guess is still infallible, as in unison with modern thought.

Most mathematicians are striking examples of the narrowing effect of a too exclusive concentration of the faculties of the mind on one class of ideas, to the exclusion of the wider range of the philosopher or theologian.*

* Sir William Hamilton has already pointed this out very forcibly, but I cannot at the moment lay my hand on the passage.

By way of comparing the past and present state of civilised man—*animal rationale*—I was much struck with the curiously wise and eloquent passage you quote* from Lord Beaconsfield. It is really worth studying. I could wish to import it into this letter at length. But when, in one sentence, he says, 'No one can pretend that printing is so great a discovery as writing, or algebra as language,' I am inclined to express a doubt whether language is one of man's inventions, and not rather a divine endowment. On this point of rational language, I have been struck with the utterly unsupported assumptions of the eloquent but fanciful writers of the modern school of philological mythologists. According to them primeval man was only able to find names for sun, moon, clouds, and other things he could not help seeing. These he at once, and naturally, endowed with life, just as a child attributes animation to the 'naughty' floor, chair, or table which has hurt it. As man had originally few things within the range of his observation to name, so his language consisted of a few roots—'a scanty list of formless roots'! He could name the things he saw, and a few of the most obvious acts, but the philologists will not allow him names for abstract ideas. Knowing nothing of justice, virtue, or prudence, he had of course no names for them. I cannot but wonder at the vast and imposing superstructure raised on such narrow foundations, or, to express the same idea otherwise, at the vast inferences derived from so few facts, and received by some as established truths. But what I am at the moment concerned with as connected with our subject is that, supposing the conclusions of the philologists to rest on a wider basis, philosophy will also take cognisance of the science of tradition, and will not tolerate the infractions of the unity of truth. Truth is one. I cannot, however, quite dismiss these

* *Tradition*, Preface, pp. xvi. and xvii.

speculations of the philologists without insisting that they should be able to adduce some examples of their theory of progression from formless roots now in progress before our eyes, and of the passage from names of ordinary acts and phenomena to the names of abstract ideas. Do we, in fact, find evidence in barbarous and savage tribes of indigenous progress, or evidence of the loss of previous culture? Is the aboriginal Australian rising by natural progression, or the survival of the fittest, from the times which gave him the boomerang? If we find 'formless' roots, are these the relics of a richer vocabulary, which has been lost along with the ideas it was calculated to express, or are they the first beginnings of language?

The invention of printing has been the means of disseminating amongst an immense number of half-educated or less than half-educated people—in fact, over a vast reading population—what was previously accessible only to the most highly educated, and these were men distinguished by mental vigour and intellectual endowment; they were also of the class of the most leisurely. It seems to me a penalty which we pay for the printing-press, though I do not venture to think it equipollent to its great power for good, that out of the vast mass of the half-educated should emerge men of much ability, ingenuity, and industry, who should concentrate their attention on one class of facts—should become specialists. A very useful and important function indeed; but when such people, with the aid of a lively imagination and without the necessary amount of training in philosophy, turn theorists and generalisers, they become very unscientific and unphilosophical, having entered on their special ground without the necessary amount of mental training, and the application of it to other branches of science. Hence a marvellous audacity of inference, and, perhaps, a

fanatical dependence on induction.* The wide diffusion of reading has also, I suggest, been followed by two results, which have had a tendency to weaken the intellectual faculties. The art of reading, once acquired, has been so used as to debilitate the intellectual faculties by amusing and interesting them by incomplete and shallow presentations, which seem to make that easy and pleasant which, rightly considered, is very difficult, and requires a degree of intellectual effort, fixity of thought, and careful appreciation which is hardly pleasurable. This printing, too, affords an easy and accessible record which, as generally used, impairs the memory, by loading it with food it does not assimilate, and offering a substitute for its active exercise. By the art of printing we obtain, and some of us use, a marvellous store of knowledge; but I doubt whether now, without it, and since we use this substitute for memory so largely, such a poem as the *Iliad* would be preserved among us, and handed down to posterity. Any one now, who with average intellectual powers should spend half an hour a day on the newspapers, and some hours a month on even our higher periodical literature, would, I suspect, enfeeble rather than invigorate his mental faculties. Of course this does not apply to the masterpieces of thought, which are comparatively little read, nor to the men who use the evanescent literature of the day in subordination to higher and more methodical studies.

I apply all this too discursive view of a great question, some parts of which I have very feebly and inadequately noticed, to our subject, by observing that the specialists are not generally philosophers, and that it is a service to science to compare their too hasty conclusions from the facts embraced in their own line of inquiry with the con-

* In a review in the *Month* for June, something like what precedes is more briefly and perspicuously said.

clusions deducible from other lines of investigation. Thus philology (with its few formless roots) interprets mythical and legendary lore—not as a possible indication of the theory arrived at, but as a demonstration of it. But, you say, halt a moment; the science of tradition gives a quite different interpretation to those legends. One of us must be wrong. Let us see which of us it is. It is a question of the application of the law of inference. Imagination is a fine thing in its way; it would be a grand thing to get rid of Moses and the Prophets; to prove, in accordance with Topsy's idea, that we had 'growed,' and that we are much greater people than our predecessors.* But let us agree that we are both of us subject to the law of reason; so let us condescend to be logical as well as imaginative, ambitious, or audacious. The intuitions of genius are very fine, but let us not mistake them for demonstrations. Whilst we examine the records of philology, or geology, or any other branch of science, let us not forget the records of tradition. If any one or another of these various lines of investigation results in an undeniable conclusion, the others must give way, however much they may harmonise with modern thought. We must in such a case reëxamine their facts, and the inferences drawn from them.

Returning now to your letter, I observe that you have pointed out that, since publishing your book on Tradition, you have become acquainted with M. Luken's work, *Les Traditions de l'Humanité*; and you quote from it a pregnant sentence, to which you add his observation, that others had previously regarded tradition from the same point of view. If you and I—you for yourself, and I as your commentator—were concerned, which, happily, we are not, in nicely discriminating claims to the honour of

* Since this was written I have read a newspaper outline of a lecture by Professor Huxley in which he expressly adopts and defends Topsy's notion.

originality, I should say that it is always the case that whoever announces an original idea is found, on examination of the history of his subject, to have had his precursors, who had more or less definite glimpses of what he more plainly saw, or more pointedly propounded.

To examine and collate such records as the book of Genesis, the annals of various nations, ancient inscriptions, the legends preserved by poets—even amatory poets—the legends and traditions imperfectly preserved, and however corrupted, of nations or tribes lost or disseminated, or less civilised than those which possess an existing living literature; and to examine how far these various records tell the story of the human race is surely not only as much a science as astronomy or geology, which tells some part of the story of the heavens or earth, or any other recognised science, but a more interesting and nobler one. Like other sciences it has its own class of facts, and its means and methods of inquiry; and its conclusions must, like those of other sciences, be examined and compared with those of other sciences, and, like them, be held subject to the law of sound reason—to that part of philosophy called logic, and especially to that part of logic which my friend, the late Professor De Morgan, called ‘the calculus of inference.’*

* I do not wish by this adoption of De Morgan’s nomenclature of the science of inference to be supposed to adopt his system. When his little tract, *First Notions of Logic*, published some years before the work mentioned in the text, came into my hands, I observed to a friend that the tract was a precursor of an arithmetical theory of the syllogism, or the theory of an arithmetical syllogism; and so it turned out. My friend De Morgan was educated at Cambridge, from which he emerged a well-instructed classical scholar and a mathematician of mark. But in his day philosophy was no part of the Cambridge University course, and I suspect that his logical studies commenced years after he had left Cambridge, with Whately’s *Logic*. Being a man of great intellectual power, of much originality of thought, and much preoccupied with mathematics, and not only abstract mathematics, but their application to probabilities, he struck out for himself a most ingenious, but, as I think, logically useless,

There are few things in the cultivation and advance of science of more interest than the explanation and removal of difficulties in the way of a theory of interpretation solidly founded on previous investigations, and formulated by a thinker, whose learning is illustrated by a power of just intuition. It may seem to some—it does not to me—a difficulty in predicating the identity of Nimrod and Izdubar, when the history of their exploits has been shown to be identical, or so much alike that differences must be accounted as arising from error or corruption, that the sounds on the English tongue of the letters of the names are so different. But the phonetic rendering of the characters which, in the Assyrian tablets, represent the Babylonian hero, is uncertain; and if the conviction of the late Mr. George Smith, that the true phonetic rendering of the letters in each name will render them phonetically identical, is established, it will not only remove what to some would be a difficulty, but it will do much more, it will be another direct and independent evidence of their identity; and it is certain that nothing more compels assent than such an explanation of a difficulty as converts it into an independent confirmation of the very conclusion on which it seemed at first sight to cast doubt.

The opposition theory, that Izdubar is the ‘Sun-god,’ simply amuses me. These Sun-gods are so numerous, and the lively imagination which converts so many, not only of legendary heroes, but of historical characters, into Sun-gods, is so fanciful and ingenious, that I am quite prepared for the advent of the man, of whom Professor Max Müller is the precursor, who will bring Cæsar and Prince Albert into the group.

Let us by all means, and independently of the Sun-

theory of quantified terms, inapplicable, for the most part, to the uses of the laws of thought and their application to inference, except to a few mathematical specialists.

gods found in them, examine the 'formless roots.' If it is quite clear that they represent all the power of language and ideas of their period, and are not shorthand notes of poetical legends, let us investigate the chronology of the period. One or the other of two things may emerge. We may get evidence of a loss of language and intellectual power, of decadence, in fact, from a more perfect language and a higher intellectual status; or we may find in them evidence of the confusion of tongues recorded in the Sacred Scriptures.* If of the latter, we light at once on an infancy of language. Even then I am unable to find man in the mental state of the child who attributes life and volition to the 'naughty table;' nor can I at once, and without further argument and reflection, admit that such a phrase as 'the Sun greeting his bride' is more realistic, and less poetical, than many passages in modern poetry. As a specimen of these I might quote the few lines from Milton you give in *The Nature Myth Theory* (p. v.) just received.

But, lest I should be too discursive, and run this letter to an unreasonable length, I pass to your suggestions for the scientific reduction of the various traditions of the human race, that is to say, of their treatment as a branch or department of science or philosophy, viz.

I. The examination of various lines of tradition, with the view of ascertaining their agreement or divergence, and especially whether they are independent, or the result of intercommunion; this being mainly directed towards those which confirm the historical account we possess of a universal Deluge.

II. The examination of such traditions as afford evidence of a local or partial deluge only, which may be considered cumulative and confirmatory of the former evidence.

* I had written thus far when I got your short paper, *The Nature Myth Theory*.

III. The examination of evidence of other traditions which are silent as to a deluge, but are evidence on points of the scriptural history, of which the Deluge is a part.

IV. The examination of customs, which are evidences of traditions which may be locally lost.*

I see no reason to offer you any comments on these various groups of evidence, except that the specific announcement of them, inasmuch as it comes to the ears of students and observers, will have the good effect of directing observation and record, and of classifying observed facts as they come to light. As a specimen, though a very poor one, of the discussion of the bearing of Tradition on the history of the human race, and especially on the question of primeval civilisation and barbarism, I may mention that, in an idle moment, I took up a book, *A Yachting Cruise in the South Seas*,† and, opening it casually, found an account of the natives of one of the islands, who could at the time only manufacture very rough stone axes, whilst possessing others of a much superior make; of the natives of another island showing large canoes they could no longer make or manage; and of the inhabitants of another island, living in huts on the coast, speaking of the remains of cities in the interior. If the narrator of those facts had been alive to the controversy between the Progressionists and us, and so had estimated the value of such facts, whether more or less, he would have dug deeper and recorded more.

Yours very sincerely,

E. RYLEY.

* See *Tradition*, p. 248 et seq.

† By C. F. Wood, 1875.

III.

April 17, 1878.

MY DEAR RILEY,

In these days of scepticism and uncertainty, identity of view is so precious, that I confess I am in no mood to pursue lines and shades of difference; and on the other hand, when our agreement is substantially so complete, it would be superfluous to continue the correspondence merely for the expression of unanimity. I have some hope, however, that your clearer and more comprehensive statement may accomplish what my efforts have failed to do, and may impress those whom continued belief in Holy Writ may concern—and it may reasonably concern many who have ceased to believe—with the importance of the testimony of tradition, not only in attestation of higher truths, but as a barrier against the rising tide of anarchy and socialism.*

In order that it may be seen that we have not indulged in mere phrase, I will endeavour in this final letter to deal with facts rather than with further exposition of arguments. But here is a difficulty—not because facts are scarce, but arising out of the very multiplicity of facts. I at first

* 'A letter we publish . . . tells a strange and startling story of the growth of socialism in Germany. It is startling even to Germans themselves. . . 10,000 Socialists followed the body to the grave, and the conduct of this large assemblage was even more significant than its numbers. . . They repudiate the characteristic beliefs, not merely of Christian Europe, but of civilised mankind; they proclaim that there is nothing worth enjoyment but this world to live for, and they speak of Christian faith, not merely in terms of negation, but of insult. . . Some of the causes of this state of feeling are not far to seek, and the consideration of them is pregnant with warning in the present state of Europe. Such sentiments have been in *great measure facilitated* by the manner in which German speculation has *sapped the confidence of the nation at large, not merely in all creeds, but almost in all philosophies.*'—*Times*, March 22, 1878.

'Je veux vous dire, sur ce point, une grande vérité. L'irreligion est canaille.' Lettre de Comte Joseph de Maistre à le Comte Jean Potocki, 5 Juin 1810.—*Lettres et Opuscules*, ii. 247.

thought of bringing underview—not exhaustively, of course, but perhaps more extensively than has hitherto been attempted (for each day brings new facts to the surface)—the traditional testimonies to the two great events upon which the scriptural narrative hinges—the creation of man in Paradise, and the destruction of the human race in the Deluge. I feel the ignominy of the acknowledgment that this is altogether beyond my grasp; but perhaps I shall more profitably illustrate the peculiar difficulty of the case by showing what space is necessarily occupied even when confining the inquiry to one particular line of research; and if I shall be able to contribute any light, like the light of a lantern thrown down a vista, it may indicate the ranges and extent beyond.

The particular inquiry which I shall pursue is as to the amount of evidence which exists—partly indirect, partly direct—that we are the descendants of Adam and Eve; and I circumscribe the inquiry by leaving aside several corroborative testimonies—such as the traditions of Paradise, the general consciousness of the Fall, the Golden Age, &c.—the number of which I shall perhaps best indicate by giving in a note the heads of the chapters* in the first volume of M. Luken's *Les Traditions de l'Humanité*. This letter, however, has nothing in common with M. Luken, except in so far as I make the reference.

It will be necessary to make some preliminary remarks. I agree with you in thinking that we might rest in the

* 'Ch. i. Monothéisme primitif de tous les peuples. Ch. ii. Création du monde. . . . Adam Cadmon, ou le premier homme comme macrocosme. Le chaos, le fluide primordial et le logos. Les six jours de la création. Ch. iii. Création de l'homme. Multiplication mythique du premier homme. L'homme créé en dernier lieu. Le premier homme formé du limon de la terre. La femme créée d'une côte du premier homme. Ch. iv. Le Paradis. Le Paradis comme montagne terrestre et île du bonheur. Traditions du Paradis. Influence des traditions relatives au Paradis sur les mythes de la constitution de l'univers et sur le culte des païens. Ch. v. Bonheur et chute du premier homme. . . . Traditions des peuples d'Asie. Traditions Européennes. Traditions d'Afrique et d'Amérique.'

objection *in limine* that the contrary theory has as yet advanced no proofs. At p. 26 you say: 'I contend that, on the theory of evolution, and the production of different races of men by parallel lines of evolution, we are entitled to demand *existing* examples of all the steps or stages of advance. We ought *now* to see something very near to man, which is not man, and to see what is truly man, but with difficulty distinguishable as man.'

Yet if we listen to the language held in scientific circles we should suppose that this, and much more than this, had been demonstrated.

Speaking in the name of science and from its highest pedestal, the President of the British Association, in his inaugural address at Plymouth, August 1877, says: 'I consider it impossible therefore for any one to be a faithful student of embryology, in the present state of science, without at the same time becoming an evolutionist.' And this is not said in a restricted sense, but with reference to the development of the race, and 'the views now known as Darwinism.'

And yet nothing more is shown by Professor Allen Thompson than a striking resemblance in the protoplasms and embryonic development of animals. Grant that it is true even of plants and animals also, and that 'the primordial rudiments of the future animal and vegetative systems of the embryo are traced back, as distinct from each other, to the first stage of segmentation of the germ,' and even that there is (although there is no present warrant for it) 'the prospect of our being able to trace transitions between the earliest embryonic forms occurring in the most different kind of ova.' This will not enable us to reach to the mystery of life unless we can also grasp the secret of diversity. Let us accept the facts as the last word of science. Dr. Elam (*Winds of Doctrine*, pp. 141-146) has replied by anticipation:

'The mystery is not why the embryo in all cases *should* present certain resemblances, but why it *should not*. . . Why should germ A follow a certain course of development, and germ B, identical in all ascertainable particulars, and placed under similar conditions, follow a different one? . . . Why the "differentiae" ever occur is assuredly not to be explained by community of origin. . . Now there are at least five distinct types upon which the members of the animal kingdom are constructed, which cannot possibly be reduced to any general expression or formula' (p. 141).

It will have been seen from the extract from the President's address that the scientific world has quite made up its mind on the subject of evolution; and yet Mr. St. George Mivart and Dr. Elam appear equally to have demonstrated the fallacy of the theory, using the term evolution as coextensive with Darwinism. What strikes me as surprising is, that no advertence is ever made to these counter-statements and arguments, apparently well entitled to consideration or refutation. You are not in the habit of speaking deferentially of these magnates of science; and on their side, I am afraid there will be anathemas, and they will place you out of their synagogue; for I think it has been noticed that they are apt to misconstrue disrespect to themselves as hostility to science; and yet it seems to me that nothing but good could come to science in the abstract through the contact, even in conflict, of your intellect with theirs. Some true friend to science may perhaps be found who will whisper in the ear of these august personages that they 'would be more likely to be regarded as infallible' if they would sometimes condescend to parley with human ignorance. When the scimitar, it may be, only of an outsider, of a Bashibazouk, seems to the eye to pass between the head of the President and all that constitutes him a vertebrate, we should like to see him shake his head, just to let us know that he survives, or that he is human.

For the present, then, and until further evidence is

forthcoming, I shall be content to oppose to the official declaration of science the equally confident conclusion of Elam, who has investigated the question of 'the lineal descent of man from the authorised apes,' with very close and careful analysis, 'that the doctrine is not supported *directly* by one *single fact* in the whole domain of Nature.'

But supposing that evidence of the existence of man in the boulder-clay or earlier formation were forthcoming (and the antiquity of man, if geologically proved, would, I allow, give their indirect argument some weight)—suppressing any tendency to 'scepticism in geology,' conceding, in fact, the evidence to stand—would the truth of the scriptural narrative be thereby overthrown? No, not unless it could be shown that the man in question was man of our creation, the descendant of Adam and Eve. The theory of Preadamite man, although wildly improbable, and lacking at present the slightest direct evidence, is (vide *Civiltà Cattolica*, June 1877), within certain limits, a tenable opinion.

Now let us return to the testimony of tradition. Darwinism professes to trace mankind backwards through stages of evolution indefinitely to no known commencement.* On the other hand, I maintain that there has been a persistent tradition of the human race that they were created; that they were created under circumstances or in a manner which recalls the scriptural account; and that they were created in a more perfect state. If mankind were developed from previous states of existence, is it not surprising that they should have the notion of creation among them at all, and that their theogonies and mythologies, however wildly, should profess to state the manner of their creation? I ask the Darwinians, how did the notion of 'the first man' arise? From their point of view, what constituted the first man? You very justly 'demand

* Vide Appendix A.

existing examples of all the steps or stages of advance; but I also ask—and I ask it more particularly from the point of view of tradition—what it was at the commencement that can be indicated as the first step? What was the precise change in brain or organisation which made the point of departure from the anthropoid to man? Was it ‘the thumb to the wrist,’ as suggested (and I know of no other suggestion) by Mr. Mortimer Collins?

‘There was an ape in the days that were earlier;
Centuries passed, and his hair became curlier;
Centuries more gave a thumb to his wrist:
Then he was Man—and a Positivist.’

Yet, if they would overthrow the testimony of tradition, it is a very necessary point to determine; because they must concede that there is an ancient belief, held by a large portion of the existing human race, recorded at a remote date in a book consistent in its statements, borne out by the evidence of man’s actual state, and, as will be shown, confirmed by other testimonies, that there was a first man whose name was Adam, whose original state was one of happiness and innocence—‘yes, innocence!’ Such is the notion, strangely as it may sound and difficult to account for, as a belief in the human mind, from their point of view.

My contention is that the tradition is as much a fact and as much on record as any other historical or scientific fact. How does the scientific world, which believes in evolution, account for it? Does it account for it or does it reject it? Let us argue the matter upon this simple basis of fact. It will be open, indeed, to the ‘neo-philosophers’ to object that this is the tradition of only one people. They may say, ‘The Bible, however ancient, is the record only of the Hebrew people.’

But the tradition and the record being a scientific fact, it is at this point that we invoke the science of tradition to discover whether this averment is true that the

tradition is confined to one people. In any case the difficulty will remain that one people professes to have preserved the record of its origin, which involves in its statement the history of all the rest.

I will first turn to M. Henri Luken's *Traditions de l'Humanité*, who is the author (I have not read Sepp) who, as far as I know,* has treated this matter most systematically and at latest date, and also because in his account of the traditions of the Creation he notes what I have just adverted to—the tradition of the first man among the Aryans, Chinese, Japanese, Egyptians, Phœnicians, Germans, Scandinavians, Caribs, &c.

This first man of their tradition is no doubt much confused with their cosmic (*cosmogonique*) traditions. As Luken appears to me to disentangle these traditions with much ingenuity, I shall in this instance quote the passages at length, as I think it will give the key to many cosmogonies:

'Si donc il est positif que la personne du premier homme est le principe de ce premier né de la nature, duquel le ciel et la nature sont sortis, il faut que l'histoire du premier homme, l'histoire d'Adam, ait exercé une influence sur la formation de ce premier être macrocosmique, ou en d'autres termes, l'histoire d'Adam doit être le fondement du développement du cosmos dans les cosmogonies des peuples. . . . D'après la Bible, Adam fut créé seul. Toutes les cosmogonies commencent également par avancer l'existence d'un être unique, jamais celle de deux espèces différentes; c'est cependant à quoi l'on devrait s'attendre, comme conséquence du principe païen de génération, tandis que constamment on rencontre au contraire un être unique issu du chaos. Ève fut formée d'Adam, qui vit de la sorte sortir *de sa personne un sexe différent du sien*. . . . Les peuples orientaux surtout honoraient le premier être produit par le chaos, comme hermaphrodite ou homme-femme, et le culte impudique qu'ils lui vouèrent, leur a attiré une juste réprobation.†

* *Supra*, p. 8.

† Luken, l. 62. The italics are mine, *passim*, unless the contrary is stated. I find that Faber had previously suggested a similar theory in his *Origin of Pagan Idolatry*, 1816, iii. p. 69. He says, 'The notion of

The above suggestion will be found to be a key which will unlock many indirect traditions. I will only remark upon it that, as often as not, in the traditions of savages, where everything is confused, the woman and not the man stands at the commencement of their tradition, and is not unfrequently confounded with the Creator. In point of fact, it *was* the woman who made the world we live in such as it is.

The scientific world, as we have already said, systematically ignores every argument that is not based on its own assumption of progress, and shudders at 'the embarrassing interference of tradition,' as Sir J. Lubbock candidly phrases it (*Prehistoric Times*, p. 386).

What strikes me as most strange is that what is perfectly seen on the one side is so imperfectly realised on the other. The fact, however, with which I have now to deal is that the force of the testimony of tradition, although seen, is ignored by the scientific world; and yet, according to our contention, it is legitimately within the province of science.

I have met with one attempt only to close with the contrary argument, viz. in Professor Max Müller's Preface to the Rev. W. Wyatt Gill's *Songs and Myths of the Pacific*.

Mr. Gill has acquired a somewhat invidious position

the first-created man being an hermaphrodite has doubtless arisen from a misconception of the primeval tradition, which, through Noah, was handed down to the builders of the Tower respecting the process of forming the original pair. As the woman sprang out of the side of the man, and as therefore she made a part of him before such disjunction [in misconception], it was mystically said that Adam or Swayambhuva was androgynous, and that all things were produced from an hermaphrodite unity. Afterwards, when the earth, the ark, and the moon were severally pronounced to be forms of the great mother; and when the sun, in a similar manner, became the astronomical symbol of the great father, each of these was thought to exhibit the same androgynous conjunction, each was esteemed the double parent of the world and of the whole human race.'

in the recognition of the scientific world. This no doubt has a certain explanation in the excellent manner in which Mr. Gill's evidence has been collected, and also in the fact that, as Mr. Max Müller tells us, 'Mangaia has kept itself more free from foreign influences than almost any other of the Polynesian islands.' Without, however, in the least wishing to detract from the merits of Mr. Gill, I must insist that, because Mr. Gill is intelligent and accurate, it does not follow that all previous travellers have been mystified or untruthful; nor that because we may have the evidence in Mangaia more free from the suspicion of foreign influence we necessarily have it in the most authentic form. From the point of view of degeneracy, time is an element in the consideration, and the tradition is in the way of deterioration with every year which passes by, and accordingly it is among the earlier rather than among the more recent testimonies, being equally reliable, that we should look for authenticity.

Mr. Max Müller, of course, assumes a 'mythopoeic epoch;' but it is something that he recognises also the fact of a theory of a 'descending development of the human race,' hardly an adequate or exact description, however, of the theory of degeneracy.

We must regard it all the same as a remarkable condescension and concession on the part of the scientific world; and, moreover, it is something to find an authority even upon the common facts in dispute which they will provisionally admit. Altogether, I think the conjunction of favourable auspices warrants my attempting a reply.

The legend of the creation among the Mangaians does not at first sight promise much. It will be found, however, to have the following salient points in common with the scriptural narrative. 'The originator of all things,' as from the indications given we should be prepared to expect, is a woman, 'the great mother Vari.' She creates

the first man, Vatra, 'by plucking a bit off her right side.' Vatra is represented as 'half man, half fish'—(Mr. Gill makes a reference concerning this to the engraving (Assyrian) in Smith's *Dict. of the Bible*, p. 381; I may also refer to *Tradition*, p. 202)—'the father of gods and men,' and who has twins, Tangaroa and Rongo—the one the parent of the 'fair-haired,' the other of the 'dark-haired and dark-skinned races'—the contrast, as Mr. Gill suggests, teaching the common origin of mankind.

Mr. Max Müller admits that such coincidences 'offer a *primâ facie* presumption in favour of a common origin,' but 'no longer holds' that,

'when two mythologies agree in what is irrational and foolish, they must have had the same origin, or must have come into contact with each other at some period of their history. If there was a reason for the jawbone to be used as a weapon in one country, the same reason may have existed in another. But, even if there was no reason, a fact that happened, or was imagined to have happened, in one place may surely have happened, or have been imagined to have happened, in another.'*

I think we may clear the ground very much by agreeing that whenever Mr. Max Müller alleges anything specific in explanation, as in this instance, of 'the jawbone as a weapon,' or even when he suggests a plausible solar legend in explanation (although, on the ground of Bryant and Faber's theory of the solar and stellar deification of the primeval heroes, the solar mythology, from our point of view, must be common ground), we will waive the argument; but when there are coincidences which are inexplicable from one point of view, and perfectly congruous from the other, I think that we may contend that they ought not to be wafted away on the mere

* It seems to suffice for Mr. Max Müller that Vatra means the noon or the sun at noon, ignoring one fundamental argument that the progenitors of mankind were identified with, or localised in, the celestial bodies when the era of idolatry commenced.

assertion or phrase that what has happened in one place may be imagined to have happened in another.

I will now proceed to examine, in illustration of the above remark, the only tradition with which Mr. Max Müller specifically deals. I am quite sensible that in doing so I am defending an outlying position, and, as I have said, because it is the single point against which the attack has been directed. Nothing will be proved against the substance of the argument (unless collusion is supposed) if it is shown that the tradition has not come down with the particularity alleged, but if, on the other hand, the evidence is established, 'it will be the most remarkable and valuable oral tradition of the origin of the human race yet known.'

MR. MAX MÜLLER SAYS :

'On my making inquiries whether the Polynesian tradition about Eve (Ivi), which I had discussed in my *Science of Religion*, p. 304, was to be found in Mangaia, Mr. Gill informed me that it was not, and that he strongly suspected its European origin. The elements of the story may have previously existed, and we see some traces of it in the account of the creation current in Mangaia; but Mr. Gill suspects that some of the mutineers of the Bounty may have told the natives the story, and that it became incorporated with their own notions.' Max Müller, Preface to Mr. Gill, *Myths, &c. of the Pacific*, p. xiii.

I shall extract from Mr. Max Müller's *Science of Religion* (as above) further on.

MR. ELLIS SAYS :

'After Taaron had formed the world he created man. . . . Some say . . . he caused him to fall asleep; and while he slept, he took out one of his *ivi* or bones, and with it made a woman, &c. . . . This always appeared to me a mere recital of the Mosaic account of creation, which they had heard from some European; and I never placed any reliance upon it, although they have repeatedly told me it was a tradition among them before any European arrived. Some have also stated that the woman's name was Ivi, which would be by them pronounced as if written Eve. Ivi is an *aboriginal word*, and not only signifies a bone, but also a *widow*, and a victim slain in war. Notwithstanding the assertion of the natives, I am disposed to think that Ivi

or Eve is the only aboriginal part of the story as far as it respects the mother of the human race. Should more careful and minute inquiry confirm the truth of their declaration, and prove that this account was in existence among them prior to their intercourse with Europeans, it will be the most remarkable and valuable oral tradition of the origin of the human race yet known.' Ellis, *Polynesian Researches*, 1829, ii. p. 38.

To some it may appear a waste of time or an excess of hardihood to defend so outlying a point; and I have not done so without some misgivings of incredulity, or without the fullest admission to myself that such exactness in detail *primâ facie* warrants the suspicion of European communication. From either Mr. Max Müller's point of view or my own, it may still be worth while to discuss the degree in which the statement as it stands may be credible, and also to examine the actual evidence adduced of European communication.

It is one of Mr. Max Müller's strong points, 'That when we find exactly the same name in Greek and Sanscrit we may be certain that it cannot be the same word.' As the Otaheitan has been by some traced through the Malay to Asia, it is just possible that Mr. Max Müller may see an application of this *dictum* to his case; but I have already replied by anticipation, in *Tradition*, p. 393,

'that if it can be shown that certain words . . . were preserved in tradition, and so guarded as not to come under the law of deviation which philology traces out, or to come under it on different conditions, then, on the contrary, it is exceedingly probable that we should find them identical, or at least recognisable; in any case that this is a point which must be decided according to the evidences of tradition, and not according to the laws of philology.'

Now if there were only the evidence of the retention of the name of Eve (Ivi) among the Polynesians, although the evidence might be depended upon, it could not alone produce conviction, the *à priori* probability of communication being so great, yet not so absolutely certain as to be assumed.

If, however, the mode of their retention of the name, or the mode of thought which it indicates, has features unlike the mode of thought of modern European nations, but has features in common with the mode known to have been traditional among a people who lived at a remote date and in every way separated from them, it is not easy to conceive how it could have come to them through the channels of recent European intercourse.

This evidence, in connection with what follows, will be found in the fact which Ellis records, that they had the same word for woman (widow) and for a bone, and the name for both bearing close resemblance to the scriptural name of the mother of the human race.

I contend, moreover, that the point is equally made if the word 'ivi' is only traditional in an applied and secondary sense, if bone is called 'ivi' through associations with the name of the first woman, and in advertence to the fact of the creation of the first woman from the bone of the first man.

Now Luken (i. ch. iii. § xiii.) has exactly similar instances of tradition among the Greeks, Indians, Persians, Germans, Mexicans, &c. I will quote only with reference to the Greek tradition. Luken says (i. p. 98):

'The tradition of the woman, formed from a rib, was known also to the Greeks. They tell how Demeter, the first mother, had devoured the shoulder-blade of Pelops, the primitive man, and for this reason a divine hand had given to Pelops a shoulder of ivory. According to others it was a rib; and, in later times, the celebrated rib of ivory which should have replaced it was shown at Elis, as a sort of relic. It is according to the same idea that tradition pre-

tended that the "Palladium" or ancient image of Pallas Minerva, the first woman, had been made by means of the bone of Pelops. At Sparta, Leda, the celebrated mother of the Dioscuri, who play the rôle of Cain and Abel, was called *πλευρώνια*, i.e. formed from the ribs of man (rib, *πλευρῶν*). The Greeks indeed said in form of proverb *πλευραὶ εἰσιν αἱ γυναῖκες*, which signified "women are ribs;" and *πλευρα*, rib, was the phrase for a wife.'

The point which I seek to establish is that if the Greek and Otaheitan have both the same word for woman (widow and spouse) and for bone, if this analogy is traceable to an extrinsic notion, and not to something inherent in human nature, it must be so traceable to a time when the ancient Greek (or his ancestor) and the ancestor of the Otaheitan were in contact. The point would be in its measure sustained if any other part of the human body were substituted in the legend, the main fact being that the woman was created out of the person of the man. *En passant* I may add that I see an analogous tradition in the use in the Latin language of the same word, *malum*, for apple and for evil.

Among other traditions of the creation narrated by Ellis it is said (ii. p. 42) that Taaroa created man out of the earth or sand; and (p. 192) I find the word 'ivi' apparently used in a cognate sense in the compound word 'To-ivi,' meaning without parents.*

In Mr. Gill's tradition of the creation there are, as we have seen, many points of resemblance to the biblical account recognised by Mr. Max Müller, to which might be added that their various names for the workers of creation (put into commission as it were) sound like wild paraphrases of the name given to the first parent, 'because she was the mother of all the living.' One of the personages in the Mangaian legend is Vatra, and he is represented just as the fish-god is in the Chaldean legend. As we have

* *Vide infra*, p. 63.

seen (*Tradition*, &c., p. 202), he bears resemblance to Noah, to the Mexican diluvian hero, and to the Aryan legend (*Tradition*, &c., p. 197), which incontestably embodies a tradition of the Deluge. It may be well therefore to mention also the superstition regarding the fish connected with storms at sea and earthquakes in the Caroline group (Kotzebue's *Voyages*, iii. p. 205).

The following passage from Kotzebue (*Voyages of Discovery into the South Sea*, &c., 1815-18, ii. p. 201) is still more relevant to the matter we are discussing with Mr. Max Müller, and is in any case remarkable. Kotzebue says :*

'The 11th Oct. 1817.—I was attracted to-day by the sound of a muffled drum to the morai. As it was not taboo-day I supposed that the people engaged in it were priests. . . . Two islanders appeared . . . and proposed to me to enter. I was astonished that this permission was extended to me, and was not without some fear that the priests might take it into their heads to sacrifice me to their gods. Separated from my people . . . I resolved at least to be on my guard, and was conducted through the sacred gate. As this morai, as I have previously said, was built up in haste after the destruction of the old one, it could not give me a right idea of such a sanctuary, . . . six small houses close together forming a half circle. . . . Near a hut stood two complete statues; . . . between them a pole was fixed in the ground, the point of which had been hung with bananas. The woman (statue), turning her face to the man, *seized with her left hand the fruit, while he stretched out his right hand towards it.* On seeing this, every one must think of Adam and Eve; and I was very sorry to have nobody with me to explain this allegory. . . . [The priests it is true did not treat the statues very reverently, but] . . . one of the small chapels was covered round with mats; from this proceeded the noise of the muffled drum [compare Mandan ceremony, *Tradition*, &c., p. 257], sometimes interrupted by the lamentable cries of a man;† and the whole made so unpleasant an impression on me that I was glad to go away.'

Compare the engraving in Mr. George Smith's *Chal-*

* *Vide* Appendix B.

† In Mangaia, where, according to Mr. Max Müller, no similar tradition exists, at p. 271 of Mr. Gill's book we find the word 'eva' as the equivalent of dirge and mourning.

dean *Account of Genesis*, p. 91, of which Mr. G. Smith says :

'One striking and important specimen of early type in the British Museum collection has *two figures, sitting one on each side of a tree, holding out their hands to the fruit*, while at the back of one is stretched a serpent. We know well that in these early sculptures none of these figures were chance devices, but all represented events or supposed events and figures in their legends; thus it is evident that a form of the story of the Fall, similar to that of Genesis, was known in early times in Babylonia.'

Luken (i. 86) also mentions other instances of the first parent being called by the names of Hevih and Iva* in New Zealand and the Navigator's group. The New Zealand tradition having been recorded by Nicholas, *Narrative of a Voyage to New Zealand in 1814-15*, at a date when, as Luken remarks, 'no European missionary had as yet visited the country.'

Now Ellis and Nicholas cannot well both have invented this tradition unless we suppose them to have been in collusion; and if not in collusion, then the European communication which grafted the tradition cannot have been the same communication. I shall presently discuss the mode of communication suggested, viz. contact with the mutineers of the *Bounty*.

Before I can proceed to discuss this point I must exhaust the evidence which Mr. Max Müller's authority (Mr. Gill) supplies; and I think, considering how little Mr. Max Müller led us to expect it, the evidence which I have to unfold is somewhat surprising.

At p. 221 Mr. Wyatt Gill thus narrates the legend of Eneene and his wife Kura :

'In the sacred islet lived Eneene, his wife Kura, and his sister

* 'The great mother Vari,' in Mr. Gill's cosmogony, may conjecturally have been Ivvari, ri being a likely terminal; and if so, the great mother Ivvari.

Umnei. These women were young and fair, and loved to roam the woods in quest of sweet-scented flowers, which they weaved into wreaths and necklaces. On one occasion they fortunately discovered a noble "bua," whose far-spreading branches were covered with fragrant yellow blossoms. The sisters-in-law sat awhile at the foot of the tree discussing the division of the spoil. It was clear that Kura should collect on one side of the tree and Umnei on the other. But the great central branch seemed the richest prize of all. It was eventually agreed that Kura should have this treasure. . . . It became evident that Kura was gathering more than fell to her share. To punish her Umnei took possession of the coveted central branch. The wife of Eneene was speedily chastised for her covetousness without the intervention of Umnei; for the branch on which she was leaning heavily in order to steal some of her sister-in-law's suddenly broke. Kura, basket and all, fell with the branch of the *sacred tree*, cleaving the earth, and continued to fall until she reached Araiki or spirit world.*

The sequel of the history is too long for extraction, but hardly less curious, being the descent of Eneene to Hades in search of his wife, and her rescue, analogous to the descent of Orpheus into Hades in search of Eurydice (concerning which *vide Tradition*, &c., p. 172). I should have thought that it was impossible not to recognise that the above legend was cognate to the history, or, as Mr. Max Müller would say, to the legend, of Adam and Eve.

Let us compare it with the Iroquois legend of the creation narrated by Père Lafitau (*Mœurs Américains*, 1724, i. p. 93). The Iroquois say that 'in the beginning there were six men (the people of Peru and of Brazil agree as to the number)' [the six men correspond to the six days of creation inclusive of the creation of man].

'Whence came these men? It is what they cannot tell. There was not yet land; they wandered at the will of the winds; there

* Mr. W. Gill does not appear to see the bearing of this myth, for his only remark is (p. 224), 'The purport of the myth is to indicate the standard faith of the past—that the souls of the dead congregate on this tree, and *on its branches* are borne by a merciless fate to Hades.' (Italics mine.)

were no women, and they were conscious that their race would perish with them. At length they learnt, I do not know how, that there was one in heaven. . . . One of them, Hagonaho, or the wolf, transported himself there. [Compare Milton's description of Satan's alighting in Paradise]. . . . On arrival he waited at the foot of a tree until this woman went out, as was her wont, to draw water from a fountain near to the spot where he remained. . . . The man entered into conversation with her, and made her a present of the fat of a bear. . . . A curious woman who loves to talk, and who receives presents, does not long contest the victory. This one was frail in heaven itself and allowed herself to be seduced. The lord of heaven perceived it, and in his wrath he chased and precipitated her: but in her fall the tortoise received her on his back. [Compare this with the Aryan traditions of the tortoise.] Upon which the otter and the fish, taking clay from the depths of the sea, formed a little island, which gradually increased, and which extended into the form in which we see the earth at this day. This woman had two sons [compare this with Mr. Gill's Mangaian legend, *supra*, p. 47], who fought. They had unequal arms of which they knew not the strength; those of the one were offensive, of the other incapable of injuring, so that he was killed without a struggle. From this woman all men are descended by a long succession of generations.'

It is to this or a similar event in their legendary history that they trace the distinction of the Iroquois and Huron families into wolves, bears, and tortoises. Père Lafitau sees analogies to this legend in the myth of Prometheus mounting up to steal fire from heaven, and in the fall of Até from heaven (Homer, *Il.*, 9, v. 500 and 19). 'Até or Atté was an exclamation of the Bacchanals as well as Evœ' (*vide infra*, p. 66). The floating island, as Père Lafitau remarks, has resemblance to the fable of Latona, pursued by the serpent, finding an asylum on the floating island Delos.

The resemblance of the fate of Até driven from heaven or paradise, on account of sin, but slowly pursued by the *λιταί*, i.e. by prayers, the daughters of Zeus, *Διὸς κοῦραι μεγάλοι*, to the calamity which befell Evê (and the Kura

of the Mangaian legend can hardly be ignored, as Père Lefranc says :

‘On y démas la femme dans le Paradis terrestre. l'arbre de la science du bien et du mal la tentation ou elle eut le malheur de succomber. que quelques hérésiques ont cru être un péché de la chair, fondé peut-être sur les altérations des idées payennes ; on y découvre la œuvre de Dieu chassant nos premiers pères du lieu de délices où il les avoit placés, et qui pouvoit être regardé comme le ciel en comparaison du reste de la terre . . . enfin on y croit voir le meurtre d'Abel tue par son frère Caïn.’

And yet, although the resemblances are great, Até is not exactly the counterpart of Eve. As Mr. Gladstone remarks (*Homer and the Homeric Age*, ii. p. 159), ‘The word temptress would perhaps better represent the Homeric idea of *Ἀτῆ* ;’ and this may perhaps give us the clue to the tradition appearing in duplicate in the Mangaian legend, Kura and Umnei jointly playing the part of Eve.

In this Mangaian legend we have, then, the substance of the tradition, although we have not the identity of names. This need not be expected, even if an antecedent probability were asserted. Many causes of complication and confusion would doubtless have arisen. I do not contend for more than that there is no *à priori* impossibility in the tradition of the names, and that there is some evidence of this being actually the fact. It is a step in the direction to show that, among the people who are alleged to have retained the name of one of our first parents, the main facts of their history at any rate have been traditionally transmitted. If indeed a primeval tradition has floated to these times, it can hardly have come alone ; there will be a presumption that more than one such tradition has drifted down. On the other hand it would be expecting too much to demand evidence of all primeval lore or of every prehistoric fact. The strange

tenacity and unaccountable lapses in the same individual memory may serve as a measure in the inquiry; yet we must be careful in concluding from our experiences in days when the human memory is rendered indolent and effeminate through the dubious advantage of a daily printed record; so that it has come to be said that a man remains through life ignorant of the events during the twenty years before he was born or before he attains his majority, and will painfully and uncertainly collect them if he requires them. We must be careful, I have said, in concluding as to the experiences in days when tradition was oral, and when society was organised on the lines of tradition.*

In any case, as regards the present inquiry, I think the intrinsic improbability of the retention of the tradition would be much diminished if it could be shown that any other primitive word, or word at any rate which indisputably connects the Mangaiaans with a remote period of history, was familiar to them. The difference between 3000 and 4000 years is inappreciable; in other words, if it can be proved that the Polynesian race have a word which is identical with the word for a common idea found in the Vedas, it is no longer beyond belief that they should have retained the name of the mother of the human race, which, on the scriptural lines, was presumedly current at the Deluge.

At p. xiv. of Mr. Max Müller's Preface to Mr. Wyatt Gill's *Myths and Songs from the South Pacific*, he says :

'At first sight what can be more startling than to see the interior of the world, the invisible or nether world—the Hades of the Mangaiaans, called Avaiki, *Aviki* being the name of one of the lower regions, both among Brahmans and Buddhists? But we have only to look around, and we find that in Tahitian the name for Hades is Hawai'i; in New Zealand, Hawaiki, and more originally, I suppose,

* Vide *Tradition*, &c., p. 120.

Sawaiki; so that the similarity between the Sanskrit and Polynesian words vanishes very quickly.'

But does it vanish? Is not the similarity sufficiently striking in 'Savaiki'? Moreover, Mr. Max Müller does not tell us why this form, and not Avaiki, should be assumed to be the original. Mr. Gill (p. 166) says the three forms (as above) 'are only slightly varying forms of the same word,' and 'that it is only since the introduction of Christianity'—by which, I suppose, Mr. Gill means only that recently—'the belief has sprung up that Avaiki, from which the first inhabitants of this island came, is Savai'i' (there being no *k* in the Tahitian dialect), 'the largest island in the Samoan group. But at the Penrhyns not only is the word Savaiki current, but there is the expression 'going to Savaiki,' when referring to death. The strong point is that all the three words, 'slightly varying forms of the same word,' are words to express their idea of, or their location of, Hades. Mr. Gill (p. 152) says :

'The proper name for Hades is Avaiki; in Tahitian, Hawai'i; in New Zealand, Hawaiki. Many other expressions occur in these ancient songs and myths; but they are to be regarded as designations for places or territories in *Avaiki*, the vast hollow* over which the island is supposed to be placed.'

But this word by which they designate Hades is the same as in Sanskrit; the same or a similar word expressing the same idea!

Mr. Max Müller apparently suggests that the word Ivi may have been conveyed to them by the mutineers of the *Bounty*. Let us consider the probabilities of this theory; it will be curious if the inquiry elicits facts which will tend to confirm us in our view.

The strange story of the mutiny of the *Bounty* is

* We have so seen it regarded in the legend we have just examined, *supra*, p. 54.

sufficiently well known, and only the outline of the facts require to be stated. The mutiny took place, on the 28th April 1789, near the island of Tofoa, 19° S. lat., 184° W. long. According to one account, they sailed first to Otaheite; according to another, they went first to Toobouai (about 300 miles to the south of Otaheite). In any case, they reached Otaheite on the 6th June, sailed on the 19th June, arrived at Toobouai 26th June. Left Toobouai for the last time 15th September, arrived at Otaheite 20th September 1789. Either on this occasion or in the previous June sixteen of the number left the ship, and remained on the island until they were taken on board the Pandora, May 1789. Now these sixteen (or rather fourteen, for one was killed by a companion and the murderer slain by the natives) seem to have led a very isolated life, and appear to have been taken in the locality where they had landed. Of these fourteen only can it be said that there is any probability of their having indoctrinated the natives, and that in the locality where they remained in the island of Otaheite. Let us follow the career of the rest who stayed on board the Bounty. According to the above dates, the mutineers could not have influenced the natives up to that time. They never landed except with hostile intent in either of their attempts upon Toobouai. On the first occasion, it is said* 'that quarrels among themselves and disputes with the natives determined them upon leaving the island,' off which they could not have remained more than a fortnight. It is also said that an attempt to land was made, and that 'the natives were dispersed by a discharge of cannon and musketry; on this they fled, and refused to hold any further intercourse with their visitors.' In their second expedition to Toobouai there is mention 'of quarrels among themselves

* I have compared the accounts of the mutiny in the *Penny Encyclopedia* and *The Mutiny of the Bounty* (Murray, 1831).

more inveterate than before,' and that 'many of the natives who attempted to resist their wanton aggressions were shot.' Now Toobouai was the only place where they touched from the time of their leaving Otaheite till they landed on the desert island called Pitcairn's Island. It must be mentioned that they brought with them from Otaheite eight men, nine women, and seven children. The interest attaching to the story lay in the manner of their discovery. When Sir Thomas Staines in 1814 fell in with the island, not then laid down in the Admiralty charts, he was astonished to find a patriarchal community numbering forty souls, speaking very good English, living under the mild sway of the sole survivor of the mutiny, one John Adams.

In this island, inhabited, as I have just said, exclusively by the mixed descendants of the mutineers and Otaheitans whom they had brought with them, and educated by old Adams with the Bible in hand, it would not, indeed, surprise us to find mention of Adam and Eve. But I submit that it is calculated to create astonishment (for they had had no contact with other islanders) when we find trace among them of what must have been a prior aboriginal Otaheitan tradition, in the sense of the scriptural narrative, but not derived from it, concordant and concurrent, but transmitted by a distinct and independent channel. The tradition referred to will be discovered in the following extracts :

'It is remarkable enough that, although the female part of the society (as above) is highly respected, yet in one instance a distinction is kept up which in civilised countries would be deemed degrading. It is that which is rigidly observed in *all the South-Sea Islands*, and indeed throughout almost the whole Eastern world, that no woman shall eat in presence of her husband; and though this distinction between man and wife is not carried quite so far in Pitcairn's Island, it is observed to the extent of excluding all women from table when there is a deficiency of seats. It seems they de-

fended the custom on the ground *that man was made before woman*, and is entitled therefore to be first served.'—*The Mutiny of the Bounty* (Murray, London, 1831), p. 315.

Captain Beachey* (*Voyage to the Pacific*, 1831, p. 76) says of this custom, and with reference to the community at Pitcairn's Island :

'This was *the remains* of a custom very common among the South-Sea Islanders, which in some places is carried to such an extent that it imposes death upon the woman who shall eat in the presence of her husband [eating in the presence and to the incitement of the husband being one mode of expressing the primeval sin]. . . . In Pitcairn's Island they have settled ideas of right and wrong to which they obstinately adhere, and fortunately they have imbibed them generally from the best source. In the instance in question they have, however, certainly erred ; but of this they could not be persuaded, nor did they, I believe, thank us for our interference. *Their argument was that man was made first*, and ought consequently on all occasions to be served first—a conclusion which deprived us of the company of the women at table during the whole of our stay in the island.'

It is part of the narrative that the Otaheitan women (taken by the mutineers to Pitcairn, as before stated) were sufficiently in the majority to assert their own (and actually did so when four or five of the men of the *Bounty* still survived). Under these circumstances it would hardly

* I find this custom discussed in the *Sat. Rev.*, March 2, 1878, p. 263 : 'Herodotus mentions that the wives of the early Ionians would not eat with their husbands ; . . . and he gives a reason for this conduct, namely, that the ancestors of the ladies were Carians, whom the Ionians murdered. If we cross the wide gulf between the archaic Ionians and the Spaniards of Madame d'Aulnoy's time, we find that this etiquette is but slightly modified. Spanish ladies eat with their husbands, but not at the same table. . . . The coincidence thus established between forms of etiquette prevailing among people separated by time, race, and religion is so odd that one may fancy *some powerful original motive* first separated husband and wife at dinner.' Just so ; whatever the reason assigned for so widespread a custom, it must be a general one applicable to the human race ; and therefore the reason given by Herodotus can only be true for Carians and the descendants of Carians. What the testimony of Herodotus really does show is that the custom is not of yesterday, and presumably not recently diffused among the Polynesian islanders.

have been a custom suggested by them. Besides, we have seen that the custom was common to the other Polynesian islanders, with whom they had had no contact during their residence at Pitcairn.

I will again return to Mr. Max Müller's text. At p. 304, *Science of Religion*, he says :

'In this case, I believe the probability is that the story of the creation of the first woman from the bone of a man existed among the Tahitians before their intercourse with Christians ; but I need hardly add that the similarity between the Polynesian name for bone, "ivi," even when it was used as the first woman, and the English corruption of the Hebrew חַוָּה, "chāvah," Eve could be result of *accident only*. Whatever "chāvah" meant in Hebrew, whether life or living or anything else, it never meant bone ; while the Tahitian "ivi," the Maori "wheva," meant bone, and bone only.'

I have already insisted that from the scriptural point of view the tradition is equally established if 'Ivi' is their term for bone, by reason of the first woman having been called by an analogous name, or if woman is called by or associated in their language, if only secondarily, with their term for bone. Now there is a curious presumption of this when we find the native Otaheitan word identical with the name of the first woman in other tongues, and identical with the word for woman (or widow) in their own. It is, perhaps, even more strongly marked if it is the word for widow (Ellis, as above) ; for we may find the connecting link in the almost identical word Eva = 'dirge' (*supra*, p. 52), which is associated in their minds with mourning. Compare also what I have quoted from Kotzebue (*supra*, p. 52). Moreover, according to a recent and very competent authority, Mr. Fornander*—for he has spent thirty-four years among the Polynesians—'among the ancient Hawaiian legends' it is related that 'man was created on the model

* *An Account of the Polynesian Race*, by Abraham Fornander, Circuit Judge of the Island of Maui. (H. J. Trübner, 1878.)

and likeness of Kane,' their chief god, and 'afterwards the first woman was created from one of the ribs—"lalo puhaka"—of the man while asleep, and these two were the progenitors of all mankind.' It is true that he adds that they are called in these legends by different names; 'but the most common for the man was "Kumu-Nonua," and for the woman "Ke ola ku Nonua."' He says, however, that in another legend of the series 'the first man and first woman were created with the assistance of Ku and Iono (the other gods of their triad) nearly in the same manner as above narrated;*' and in this legend the name of the woman is 'Owe.' Among the Marquesans 'Atea' and 'Owa' are the first progenitors. Of the Society group he says (p. 65), just as we have seen in Ellis, it is said:

'The generally current tradition on the Society group is, that man was a descendant of Taaroa through sundry demi-gods; but others, more in accordance with the Hawaiian legends, make him a direct creation of Taaroa, who made him out of red clay (araea),* and made the first woman from one of his bones; and hence she was called Iwi, literally, "the bone."'

Fornander adds:

'In the Samoas and in Rotumah the name of the first woman is given as "Iwa," thus connecting itself with the Tahitian "Iwi," the Marquesan "Owa," the Hawaiian "Owe."'

With reference to the diversity of names I will venture to remark that there may be very well two distinct lines of tradition upon the scriptural indications. In Gen. iii. 20 'Adam called the name of his wife Eve, because she was the mother of all the living; but in Gen. ii. 23 Adam had said, 'This now is bone of my bones; . . . she shall be called woman, because she was taken out of man.'

As, however, Mr. Max Müller refers to what he had said at p. 47, *Science of Religion*, I will endeavour before

* p. 63.

† Vide *Tradition*, p. 134.

proceeding to convey my impressions of the sense of the passage.

'After these preliminary explanations . . . we can well understand that, while, if speaking and thinking in a modern language, Adam might have been made to say to Eve, "Thou art the same as I am," such a thought would in ancient Hebrew be expressed by "Thou art bone of my bone and flesh of my flesh." Let such an expression be repeated for a few generations only, and a literal—i.e. a material and deceptive—interpretation would soon spring up, and people would at last bring themselves to believe that the first woman was formed from the bone of the first man, or from a rib, for the simple reason, it may be, because it could be better spared than any other bone.'

It is much to be regretted that Mr. Max Müller nowhere tells us the limits within which he believes or disbelieves the Bible. Mr. Max Müller, indeed, speaks of Christianity as 'our religion.' In the possibility that Mr. Max Müller believes in his belief in the Bible, I will request his perusal of a pamphlet I printed in 1877, '*The Nature Myth' Theory untenable from the Scriptural Point of View.*'* If, however, Mr. Max Müller rejects the scriptural account of man's origin, it is difficult to seize the sense in which he believes in the probability of Adam saying to Eve, 'Thou art bone of my bone;' nor can we discuss the conditions under which the Hebrews could have speculated, as they are here ingeniously made to do, unless their account of the origin of the race with Adam and Eve is true. If it is not true at all, then there is no need to disprove it by arguments which, in some sort, presuppose it. The existence of Adam, on the other hand, being a fact, the narrative of those who have so circumstantially recorded what other nations have only transmitted vaguely and indirectly is worth more in their positive assertion as to the mode in which it was brought about (still believed in, by the bye, by the majority of the

* Burns & Oates.

civilised world) than Mr. Max Müller's brand-new conjecture as to the manner in which they might have been brought to think it.

Mr. Max Müller has no hesitation (p. 47) in speaking of the history of the Creation in the second chapter of Genesis as 'in clear opposition' to what is said in chapter i. This is not so. The first chapter narrates the sequence of the order of the Creation in general terms, and it is simply said that mankind were created male and female. In the second the details are given. There is nothing in contradiction, nothing that is even contrary. At p. 302, *Science of Religion*, there is one more passage which it will be necessary to notice. He says :

'If the first man were called in Sanskrit Adima, and in Hebrew Adam, and if the two were really the same word, then Hebrew and Sanskrit could not be members of two different families of speech, or we should be driven to admit that Adam was borrowed by the Jews from the Hindoos; for it is in Sanskrit only that Adima means the first, whereas in Hebrew it has no such meaning.'

The meaning of Mr. Max Müller is here the really difficult matter to determine. Because Adima in Sanskrit means the first,* he would seem to have come to the conclusion that Sanskrit must in some way have been 'the first;' the first language we suppose, although that would be clearly against Mr. Max Müller's views. We may conjecture, on the other hand, that the Hebrew retained the true and primeval meaning of the name, and that the Hindoo in Sanskrit attached a

* I must direct Mr. Max Müller's attention to the fact that Mr. George Smith says (*Chaldean Account*, p. 295), 'The name of Adam is in the creation legends, but only in a general sense as man, not as a proper name;' and at p. 304, 'Our next fragments refer to the creation of mankind, called Adam, as in the Bible; he is made perfect, and instructed in his various religious duties, but afterwards he joins with the dragon of the deep, the animal of Tiamat, the spirit of chaos, and offends his god, who curses him, and calls down upon his head all the evils and troubles of humanity.'

secondary meaning, signifying only their tradition that Adam was the first man, making him thus the synonym for what was first—as we might say, ‘old as Adam;’ and the Greeks, though in secondary tradition, said ‘old as Iapetus.’

Without in any way professing to have exhausted the direct,* let us glance in conclusion at the indirect evidence. There is, for instance, that particular averment of the legend to which Mr. Max Müller has given his *imprimatur*. I mean Mr. Gill’s Mangaian song of the Creation, to which I have already adverted, which states that Vari-ma-te-takere, or ‘the very beginning,’ plucks a bit off her right side and it became a human being, the first man Vatra. To Mr. Max Müller it apparently suffices that Mr. Gill tells us that ‘Vatra is the noon in all the dialects of Eastern Polynesia.’ This is a point which I have discussed *supra*, at p. 47-53. It must be borne in mind also that this is their legend of the Creation, and that Vatra is the first man. Allow, however, Mr. Max Müller to start with Vatra as the noon, will the legend then as a whole become resolvable into the forms of nature myth, or traceable to the disease of language? Mr. Max Müller seems himself to imply the contrary; but then *quid vetat* that the historical tradition of the creation of man underlies the myth? If it is traceable to the disease of language, it must be to the language of those parts, or to cognate languages. If to nature myth, it must be to something inherently connected in thought with the essential conditions of nature, or we should not find it common, as I shall proceed to show that it is, to nations whom ethnology and philology would class apart, and along a

* It seems to me that the Bacchanalian ‘Evoe! Evoe!’ should be discussed in connection with the evidence adduced above. Concerning it Clement of Alexandria says, describing the orgies of the Bacchantes, ‘Coronati serpentibus et ululantes Evam. Evam illam, per quam error est consecutus: et signum Bacchicorum orgiorum est serpens mysteriis initiatus’ (*Admon. ad Gentes*, p. 9).

belt reaching almost round the world. In any case, can any reason be given why a mere solar myth should have been held so tenaciously and religiously in various parts of the world? All I can say is that Mr. Max Müller's *Science of Religion* has not explained it to me, except in so far as he shows it intermixed with the primitive monotheism. I shall presently revert to this really valuable part of Mr. Max Müller's treatise.

I will now ask you to reperuse the extract from Luken given *supra*, at p. 44. We will in the first place compare it with the Hindoo tradition. As M. Luken (i. p. 51) has pursued it in the Book of Manu,* I will turn to the Puranas. I admit the difficulty here of separating the traditions from the Pantheism, with which, as with an atmosphere, they are encircled and imbued. In their tradition of the Creation there are at least three points in common with the biblical account and with the Polynesian tradition. If, however, Darwinism were true, how are we to account for these recurring traditions of Creation at all? It would be a difficulty even if they were diverse, but they substantially agree. I shall be content to note the three following points of argument: As in the Scripture, and as in Mangaia, Tahiti, and New Zealand, night precedes day, chaos creation—these are expressions forcibly recalling verse 2 of ch. i. Genesis, 'And the spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters;' and there is the same contorted incongruous notion of the Creation as from the person of the Creator, arising, as we have seen, from the amalgamation of their tradition of Adam with their speculations and recollections regarding the Cosmogony. I will give a few quotations in illustration (Wilson's *Vishnu Purana*, i. p. 82†):

* For evidence of tradition in the Vedas and the Avesta, *vide* Père Thébaud's *Gentilism*.

† *The Vishnu Purana, a System of Hindoo Mythology and Tradition*,

'All the authorities place night before day, and the Asuras or Titans before the gods in the order of appearance, as did Hesiod and other ancient theologians.' [If the gods here referred to are the deified progenitors of mankind—the early patriarchs, more especially of the second birth of mankind after the Deluge, those of whom Cicero used the phrase that they 'were nearest the gods'—and the Titans the giants confused with the history of the fallen spirits (as regards the Titans *vide* Luken, i. p. 241), the passage quoted will fall into the lines of tradition.] The text of the Puranas, bk. i. ch. v., says (to take one of the series): . . . 'The first creation was that of Mahat, intellect; . . . the fourth that of *inanimate bodies*; the fifth that of *animals*; the sixth the *divinities*. . . . The creation of the Arvaksrotas beings was the *seventh*, and was that of *man*.' [Does not this correspond to the twofold account of the creation of man in Gen. ch. i. and ii., *vide supra*, p. 63 ?] . . . 'eighth . . . ninth . . .' At p. 55, bk. i. ch. iv., it is said, 'At the close of the past (or Padma), Kalpa, the divine Brahma, . . . beheld the universe void. He, the supreme Nārāyana, the incomprehensible, the sovereign of all creatures, invested with the form of Brahma, the god without beginning, *the creator of all things*; of whom, with respect to his name Nārāyana, the god who has the form of Brahma, the imperishable origin (*vide* editor's note, p. 21) of the world, this verse is repeated: "The waters are called Nārā, because they were the offspring of Nara (the supreme spirit); and as in them his first (ayana) progress (in the character of Brahma) took place, he is thence named Nārāyana (he whose *place of moving was the waters*)."' [NOTE. I have here given the text in full with reference to the following note of Professor Wilson.* This is the well-known verse of Manu, i. 10, rendered by Sir W. Jones.] 'The waters are called "narah" because they were the production of Nara, or the spirit of god; and since they were his first ayana, or place of motion, he thence is named Nārāyana, or "moving on the waters." Now although there can be little doubt that this tradition is in substance the same as that of Genesis, the language of the translation is, perhaps, more scriptural than is quite warranted.' To return to ch. v., it is there related, as in other of their sacred books, how Brahma created Asuras, animals, &c., from his sacred person;

translated from the original Sanskrit, and illustrated by notes derived from other Puranas, by the late H. H. Wilson, M.A., B. Professor of Sanskrit in the University of Oxford. Edited by Fitzedward Hall. (Trübner, 1864.)

* Professor Wilson says (Preface, p. xii.), 'The theogony and cosmogony of the Puranas may probably be traced to the Vedas.'

and it is then said, 'thinking of himself as the father of the world, the progenitors (the Pitris) were born from his side. The body, when he abandoned it, became the Sandhya, . . . the *interval between day and night*.' Here there seems to me to be a striking analogy with the Polynesian (Mangaian) legend which we have been examining. It will be remembered how she, who was 'the very beginning,' 'plucked off a bit of her right side, and it became the first man, Vatra;' and that 'his name means *noon* in all the dialects of Eastern Polynesia' (Gill, p. 3). I should note also that in the account of the Creation in the Vishnu Purana there is the sequence of the Creation, in the main, as we receive it from Genesis, and as we shall find it in the Chaldean. There is also the phrase common to all these, that the Creator, 'beholding' the creation, was 'well pleased,' or 'beheld it defective.'—Wilson, i. pp. 71-3 (the 'Hindoo').

I will now turn to the Chaldean account, although scarcely in detail, as Mr. George Smith's works are still fresh in recollection. It will be unnecessary, therefore, to discuss either the coincidences (we will concede the phrase) with the scriptural narrative, which are marvellous and manifest, or the divergencies, which are not greater than are to be expected in an era of corruption, which we happen to know had set in, and of which the Bible has left us the record and approximatively the date. I merely note that the points of contact with the biblical account in the Hindoo and Polynesian cosmogonies are common also to the Chaldean.

At p. 64 of the *Chaldean Account of Genesis*, Mr. George Smith says :

'The fragment of the obverse, broken as it is, is precious as giving the description of the chaos or desolate void before the creation of the world, and the first movement of creation. This corresponds to the first two verses of the first chapter of Genesis.'

The text of the Chaldean tablet is as follows :

'1. When above were not raised the heavens; 2. And below on the earth a plant had not grown up; 3. The abyss also had not broken open their boundaries; 4. The chaos (or water) Tiamat (the sea) was the producing mother of the whole of them.'

As regards the second point, it must be pronounced that there exists a remarkable resemblance between the Chaldean account and Genesis. From what point of view absolute agreement should be expected, I am at a loss to conceive; yet this objection is latent in almost every criticism I have seen. It is impossible, indeed, to decide the question absolutely, as the second, third, and fourth tablets are wanting; but in the fifth we find mention 'of the creation of the heavenly bodies, which runs parallel to the account of the fourth day of creation in Genesis, . . . while a subsequent tablet, probably the seventh, gives the creation of the animals, which, according to Genesis, took place on the sixth day.' I must add (compare *supra*, p. 69) 'the fifth tablet commences with the statement that the previous creations were delightful,' or satisfactory, agreeing with the oft-repeated statement of Genesis, after each act of creative power, that 'God saw that it was good.' 'The only difference, . . . that the expression in the Chaldean is at the head, of the Hebrew at the close, of each act.' I am not aware that the tablets afford evidence of the contorted tradition, which is the third point of contact we have noticed between the Hindoo and Polynesian tradition; but it is plainly seen in the later Chaldean tradition, preserved for us in the fragments of Berossus, handed down by Alexander Polyhistor (*vide* the text in Lenormant, *Fragmentes Cosmogoniques de Berosse*), in the fables of Belus, who formed the heaven and earth of the two portions of the body of the goddess Omoroca, and then cut off his own head, when the other gods formed man from the blood which flowed from Belus, mingled with the earth.* [Lenormant says, 'Elle porte

* Faber (*Origin of Pagan Idolatry*, i. 206-9) says, 'Oannes taught his auditors that there was a time when all things were darkness and water, in the midst of which resided various monsters (hermaphrodites, &c.). . . Over this chaotic mass . . . presided a female named Omoroca. . . Omoroca, from the description which is given of her, appears to be no

dans la langue des Chaldéens le nom de Thavath, qui signifie en grec "la mer;" on l'identifie aussi à la lune' (*Fragmens Cosmogoniques de Berosé*, ii. 12): *vide note*;* which should be read if only to realise how the theories we have cast aside are still in conformity with (or indestructible by the most recently constructed torpedoes of) modern science.]

'Mais revenons à nos moutons.' It is now a long time since we have left Mangaia; and since then we have traversed a good deal of ground—India, Babylonia, Greece; and not the India and Babylonia of to-day, but of some 4000 years since. We will now take up the same tradition at a point the most remote from Mangaia, in the Pacific archipelago—the Caroline group, touching the confines of Japan, and Mangaia opening upon the south polar sea. Kotzebue, in his *Voyage of Discovery*, 1815-18 (Longman, 1821), vol. iii. p. 203, quotes Velarde, ii. f. 291, on the belief of the former inhabitants of the Mariana Islands, in the Caroline group. 'Puntan was a very wise man, and had lived many years in the void space, before

other than the great mother, whose character comprises at once both the world and the ark. She was a marine goddess, and lay floating many a rood in the mighty deep until the hour of creation, or rather renovation, arrived. The whole world was then formed out of her body. An exactly similar account is given of the mundane egg; consequently Omoroca and the mundane egg mean the same thing. She is the same also as Isis, or Isi, or Bhavani, who similarly comprehends within herself the whole universe, and who similarly floats on the ocean during the period that it covers the face of the earth. Agreeably to this character, she is said, in the mystical jargon of Paganism, to be at once the sea and the moon. Such discordant attributes are not easily reconcilable, unless we look beyond the letter. What the ancients meant by the moon was no further the moon in the firmament than as that planet when it assumes the figure of a boat or crescent, was the astronomical representative of the great mother, by whom they doubly intended the smaller ship of the ark and the larger ship of the world; for they ascribed to the earth the form of a ship, and supposed it to float on the bosom of chaos. . . . The tradition is pursued through many lines, which it would be impossible for me to indicate in this note.

the creation of the heaven and the earth. When he was about to die, he commissioned his sister that she should make the heavens and earth out of his breast and shoulders, the sun and moon out of his eyes, and the rainbow out of his eyebrows.' In this passage there is the same leading idea that we find in the Mangaian legend; and it is also in striking analogy with the Chaldean tradition. But in giving this fable, which connects the tradition with the southernmost islands of the Pacific, Kotzebue also enables us to hand it on to another continent; for, as he tells us, the legend reminds him of what he had read in the Northern mythology.

Indeed, the passage from the Edda referred to is so curious in its unexpected resemblance that I must give it *in extenso*—in translation :

'Dic age hoc primum
Si tibi ingenium sufficit
Et tu Vafthrudnir noris :
Unde terra venit
Superneve cœlum
Primo? Sapius Gigas !

Ex Ymir carne
Creatâ fuit terra,
Sed ex ossibus saxa,
Cœlum ex cranio,
Prima frigidi Gigantis
Sed ex sanguine salum.'

From the Vafthrudismal verse, xxi.

(Edda Sæmundar, Hafniæ, 1787).

There is an almost identical verse in the *Grinmir-mal*, which, indeed, in so far as it varies from the above, tallies in expression—*e.g.* 'the eyebrows'—with the Mariana legend, *supra*, p. 71. It is as follows :

'Ex Ymaris carne
Terra creatâ sunt,
Ex sanguine autem mare
Saxa ex ossibus,

Vegetabilia ex capillis,
 Ex cranio autem cœlum,
 Sed ex illius ciliis
 Fecerunt propitii Dei
 Midgardum (mediam terram*) hominum filiis ;
 Verum ex ejus cerebro
 Sunt illæ dura indole præditæ
 Nubes omnes creatæ.'

Over and above the correspondence just noticed, it appears to me that it can hardly escape observation that the structure of these poems bears a striking resemblance both to the Vedic writings and the Chaldean fragments, and notably, I think, to the now celebrated eleventh (the Deluge) tablet in Mr. George Smith's series. The mode and form of the questions and answers in the dialogue between Odin and Frigg, Gangrad and Vafthrudnir, reminds one more of the interrogation of Parásura by Maitreya on the cosmogony in the Puranas ; besides, the subject-matter is the same. In the following respects it rather bears resemblance to the Chaldean diluvian poem. Just as Izdubar (*vide supra*, p. 13) in the latter 'takes his journey in search of Hasisadra, Noah or Hasisadra in his ark' (*Chaldean Account*, &c., pp. 168-264), so Odin, under the name of Gangrad, goes in search of Vafthrudnir.

CHALDEAN	THE EDDA
(According to the fragments preserved).	(Vafthrudismal).
	<i>Odin.</i>
'Izdubar struck with disease, Illness covering his . . . Having the brand of the gods on his . . . There was shame of face on . . . To go on the distant path his face was set. Sabitu afar off pondered, Spake within her heart and a resolution made.	'Que me conseilles-tu, Frigg ? Il me tarde de partir Pour aller voir Vafthrudnir. J'ai, je l'avoue, une grande curi- osité de parler sur les anti- quités Avec ce Iote, qui sait tout. Que ton voyage soit heureux ! que ton retour soit heureux !

* *Vide* Appendix C.

... Izdubar said to Sabitu,
Sabitu, why dost thou shut thy
place?

Thy gate thou closest.

... Urhamsi also said to Izdu-
bar,

Thou goest on the distant path.

... Izdubar and Urhamsi rode
in the ship.

The ship the waves took, and
they...

A journey of one month and
fifteen days.

On the third day in their course
Took Urhamsi the waters of
death' (t. x.).

T. XI.

'Izdubar after this manner also
said to Hasisadra afar off,

I consider the matter...

... I come up after thee.

... Now thou hast done, and
in the assembly of the gods
alive thou art placed.

Hasisadra after this manner
also said to Izdubar,

Be revealed to thee Izdubar the
concealed story,

And the judgment of the gods
be related to thee.'

Then follows the account of
the building of the Ark and the
Flood, &c.

'... Make a ship after this...
I destroy (?) the sinner and life...
Cause to go in (?) the seed of life,
all of it, to the midst of the
ship.

The ship which thou shalt make,
600 (?) cubits shall be the mea-
sure of its length, and,' &c.

... Odin partit donc pour
éprouver la sagesse
De ce Iote, qui sait tout.
Il arriva...

Odin.

'Je te salue, Vafthrudnir; je suis
entré dans la demeure
Pour voir ta personne.
Je voudrais surtout savoir si tu
es savant
Et versé en tout Iote.'

Odin is here questioned by
Vafthrudnir.

Odin (Gangrad) is then al-
lowed to ask:

'Répond, Vafthrudnir, a cette
première question:
D'où sont venus, au commence-
ment, la terre 'et la ciel? Dis
cela savant Iote!'

Then follows the reply, as given
in the Latin translation (*supra*,
p. 72).

In fine Odin (Gangrad) asks:
'Puisqu'on te dit si savant et
que tu possèdes la science?
Réponds, Vafthrudnir, a cette
huitième question:

Quel est ton plus ancien sou-
venir?'

Vafthrudnir.

'Dans la rigueur des hivers,
avant que la terre fût créée'
(query, re-created? *Vide note*,
Appendix), 'Bergalmir nagint;
Mon plus ancien souvenir c'est
que ce Iote intelligent
S'est mis dans une barque.'

... &c.

George Smith's *Chaldean Account of Genesis*, tablets x. and xi.

'Poèmes Islandais tirés de L'Edda de Sæmund, avec une traduction par F. G. Bergmann' (*Mém. de la Soc. Asiat. de Paris*, Imp. Royale, Paris, 1838).

I think you will now be in a better position to judge whether my impressions are correct; and, perhaps, the extracts which I have given from the poems, so strangely preserved to us amidst the ice of Scandinavia, will suffice to convince us that, in whatever sense the poems are to be regarded as the work, whether the production or compilation, of Sæmund Sigfusson, yet in their structure, and conceptions as to the Cosmogony, they have much more in common with the notions and traditions which appear to have prevailed in the plains of Babylon some 4000 or 5000 years ago than with the notions current in the tenth century of our era; and I must add there is nothing in either of the poems cited to suggest the contrary.

Having found what would seem to be a very similar tradition at the opposite extremities of the Polynesian archipelago; having discovered that this tradition was common also to Chaldæa, Judæa, and ancient Greece, and that it reappears in Scandinavian literature, we might perhaps repose upon the induction; but I submit to you that it is equally discernible in the legends of the American continent.

Bancroft (*Native Races of the Pacific States of North America*, iii. p. 59) gives a Mexican narration ('of a distinctively Mexican and ruder vein of thought'), in which, along with confused legends, resembling the legend of Deucalion, with allusion to the seven caves (compare *Tradition*, p. 198, with respect to the number seven, and Faber, *O.P.M.*, iii. 108, as to the worship of caves in connection with the diluvian tradition), and with allusion also to Tlotli, the bird-messenger, there is an account of

one of the creations of man (the Deluge being in all tradition a fresh creation of man, and the creation of angels and of man commonly confounded), which is narrated in this manner :

‘The fallen gods, having consulted together, sent one of their number, called Xolotl, down to Hades, as their mother had advised.’ [She had told them ‘go beg of Mictlantetli, Lord of Hades that he may give you *a bone or some ashes* of the dead that are with him; which having received you shall sacrifice over it, sprinkling blood from your own bodies.’ (Compare the Chaldean account as above, p. 70, of Belus, ‘who formed the heaven and the earth of the two portions of the body of the goddess Omoroca, and then cut off his own head, when the other gods formed man from the blood which flowed from Belus, mingled with the earth.’)]

The messenger succeeded in getting a bone of six feet long; ‘and then, wary of his grisly host, he took an abrupt departure, running at the top of his speed. Wroth at this, the infernal chief gave chase.’ A fall; the bone broken in pieces.

‘Reaching the earth he put the fragments of bone into a basin [compare Medea and the Druidical caldron, Faber, *O.P.M.*, iii. p. 167], and all the gods drew blood from their bodies and sprinkled it into the vessel. On the fourth day there was a movement among the wetted bones, and a boy lay before them all; and in four days more, the blood-letting and sprinkling being kept up, a girl was lifted from the ghastly dish. The children were given to Xolotl to bring up, and he fed them on the juice of the maguay. Increasing in stature they became man and woman, and from them are the people of the present day descended.’

Also at p. 63, Bancroft says :

‘In their oral traditions the Tezcucans agreed with the usual Mexican account of creation—the falling of the flint from heaven to earth, and so on—but what they afterwards showed in a picture, and explained to Fray Andres de Olmos as the manner of the creation of mankind was this: the event took place in the land of Aculma on the Tezcucan boundary. . . It is said that the sun, being at the hour of nine, cast a dart into the earth at the place we have

mentioned, and made a hole; from this hole a man came out, the first man, and somewhat imperfect withal, as there was no more of him than from the armpits up, much like the conventional European cherub, only without wings. After that the woman came out of the hole. The rest of the story was not considered proper for printing by Mendieta; but at any rate from these two are mankind descended. The name of the first man was Aculmaitl—*i.e.* aculli, *shoulder*, (comp. above, p. 50) and maitl, *hand* or *arm*—and from him the town of Aculma is said to take its name. And this etymology seems to make it probable that the details of the myth are derived, to some extent, from the name of the place in which it was located; or that the name of the first man, belonging to an early phase of the language, has been misunderstood, and that to the false etymology the details of the myth are owing.'

Neither of these local explanations which Bancroft suggests will account for the coincidences with the other traditions I have adduced.

There comes the question then, Are these Mexican traditions and these Scandinavian poems, embodying the same notions and belief, preserved by people so remote; in such different climates, and under such varied conditions, spontaneous productions—the mere natural effusions of nature worship—or were they the traditional records in verse of people who were once in contact? Upon a retrospect of the ground I have gone over I contend that, however much I may err in believing in the Bible, I am justified in concluding, unless all things happen at hazard, that there must have been a time when the different families of mankind who hold these common beliefs—now 'wide as the poles asunder'—were once in contact. I shall conclude this inquiry with an examination of three recent theories, all tending to corroborate this surmise.

It will be well, however, previously to point out that the Bible, which records this fact, also states the circumstances under which mankind separated; and that this fact is also independently attested by the Chaldeans in

tablets dating back to a time which places the testimony beyond the suspicion of subsequent communication. *Vide* Mr. George Smith's *Chaldean Account of Genesis*, p. 158 to p. 166.

I. The first theory is, that there was a particular stage in human existence in which mankind arrived at the knowledge of God, although this knowledge was 'hidden in mythological disguises.' This is a theory of Mr. Max Müller's; and I have already recognised its value, for I maintain that it establishes the facts of the primitive monotheism for which many Christian apologists have contended. Of course with Mr. Max Müller the monotheism is not primitive; but concerning that more anon. It suffices that, by his own methods, Mr. Max Müller establishes the fact, not only for the Aryan and Semitic races, but with much ingenuity also for the Chinese, Mongolian, Samoyede, and other Turanian people. To which we may add the more recent testimony of Dr. Duncker for Egypt.*

Notwithstanding this attestation, the importance of which I admit, and this assemblage of facts, which must remain in common, it will be very difficult for us to get on the same ground with Mr. Max Müller.

* Professor Max Duncker, in his *History of Antiquity* (Bentley, 1877), i. p. 43, says of the Egyptian supreme god 'Ptah,' 'He was the father of the sun-god.' The Egyptians 'worshipped Ptah not only as fire, but as the spirit of warmth and light generally;' and they 'must have regarded him as the origin and source of light.' Inscriptions name him 'the lord of truth,' 'the father of truth,' 'the ruler of the sky,' 'the king of both worlds.' Professor Duncker adds, 'As the god of light which shows everything in its true form, he is the spirit of truth. . . . He is called 'the father of the fathers of the gods;' 'he must have been to them the first and oldest god, the beginning of the gods and of all things.' Thus Ptah was one of the forms under which the Egyptians invoked the creator, the highest god. On a pillar at Memphis, now in the Berlin Museum, belonging to the nineteenth dynasty, he is called 'the only unbegotten begetter in the heaven and on the earth,' 'the god who made himself to be god, who exists by himself, the double being, the begetter of the first beginning.' Other inscriptions and records denote him as 'the creator in heaven and earth, who has made all things, the lord of all that is and is not.'

From our point of view, either religion is superfluous, or it is the worship of the Supreme Creator. It is only worship, however, in so far as it is acceptable to Him. But the essential attribute of the Divinity is truth; and it can only be acceptable in so far as it is true. Therefore the classification of religion into true and false, which Mr. Max Müller rejects, must to us be the only real classification, and, as it seems to me, equally applicable to his facts. I think, therefore, you will equally fail with me to divine the sense in which Mr. Max Müller (p. 35) is able to 'value religion and reverence it, in whatever form it may present itself.'

The difficulty again of finding common ground will be apparent in Mr. Max Müller's manner of dealing with the question as to a primeval revelation.

'This universal primeval revelation is only another name for natural religion, and it rests on no authority but the speculations of philosophers' (p. 137).

Wherever I have seen the theory it has always been, not as a speculation, but as an inference from the Bible narrative, and it again becomes a question to what extent he rejects it. If Mr. Max Müller wishes to clear the atmosphere of the theory, he must refute it upon its own lines. This is applicable also to expressions we meet with in the next page:

'A universal primeval religion, revealed direct by God to man, or rather to a crowd of atheists;' and that it 'was more consonant with the general working of an all-wise and all-powerful Creator that he should have endowed human nature with the essential conditions of speech, instead of presenting mute beings with grammars and dictionaries ready-made.'

With us it is simply a question, when the question is stated historically, whether Adam and Eve were endowed with the faculty of speech, and were able to transmit it to their descendants, and beyond this the extent of the com-

munications made by God to Adam and Noah. 'Mutes,' and 'crowds of atheists' must be altogether eliminated from the scene.

Taking the Bible only as the most important historical record of the human race (holding together, moreover, by the testimony and coherence of its intrinsic evidence, *vide* Rev. W. Smith's great work, *The Pentateuch* (Longmans, 1868), we can, with this background, readily accept Mr. Max Müller's philological conclusions at pp. 171 and 216, which I transcribe *in extenso* :

'I wish to call back to your recollection the fact that, in exploring together the ancient archives of language, we found that the highest god had received the same name in the ancient mythology of India, Greece, Italy, and Germany, and had retained that name, whether worshipped on the Himalaya Mountains, or among the oaks of Dodona, on the Capitol, or in the forests of Germany. I pointed out that his name was "Dyaus" in Sanskrit, "Zeus" in Greek, "Jovis" in Latin, "Tiu" in German; but I hardly dwelt with sufficient strength on the startling nature of this discovery. These names are not mere names; they are historical facts—ay, facts more immediate, more trustworthy, than many facts of mediæval history. These words are not mere words; but they bring before us, with all the vividness of an event which we witnessed ourselves but yesterday, the ancestors of the whole Aryan race—thousands of years, it may be, before Homer and the Veda—worshipping an unseen Being, *under the selfsame name**—the best, the most exalted name they could find in their vocabulary—under the name of light and sky' (p. 171).

It is a real pleasure to find oneself in unison with Mr. Max Müller, although we approach each other from different points of view. I give also the extract at p. 216, as here Mr. Max Müller himself summarises his views, and it brings also to a point the matter we wish to consider :

'Allow me, in conclusion, to recapitulate shortly the results of this lecture. We found, first of all, that there is a natural connection between language and religion, and that therefore the classification of languages is applicable also to the ancient religions of the

* I have italicised these words.

world. We found, secondly, that there was a common Aryan religion before the separation of the Aryan race; a common Semitic religion before the separation of the Semitic race; and a common Turanic religion before the separation of the Chinese and the other tribes belonging to the Turanian class. We found, in fact, three ancient centres of religion' (p. 216).

At p. 167 it had been previously stated that

'names of the principal deities—words also expressive of the most essential elements of religion, such as *prayer*, *sacrifice*, *altar*, *spirit*, *law*, and *faith*—have been preserved among the Aryan and among the Semitic nations.'

There is not a word here which might not have been written from the scriptural point of view. The result of Mr. Max Müller's examination is that the religions of antiquity, after their separation, and after they had passed into a state of idolatry and corruption, are brought back into the lines of demarcation which correspond to the scriptural indications respecting the families of Shem, Ham, and Japhet. But not only so, there are evidences in the pages under review that there must have been a time when not only the different branches of these families, but the three parent-stocks themselves, were in contact. I will give, in illustration of my meaning, the 'Tien' of the Chinese. 'It is clear from many passages that with Confucius "Tien," or the Spirit of Heaven, was the supreme deity' (p. 196). 'This "Tien," according to the Imperial Dictionary of Kanghee, means the Great One—he that dwells on high, and regulates all below' (p. 194).

Tien is, moreover, with great probability, identified by Mr. Max Müller with the Mongolian 'Tengri' and the Hunnish 'Tangli,' both being words used for god and sky. Now if you will refer back to p. 80, you will see that 'Dyaus' in Sanskrit, 'Tiu' in German, &c. have been also identified by Mr. Max Müller with god and sky. Now I have asserted (p. 49) that we have the right to look at these etymologies from the point of view of tradition; and

so regarding the evidence, we have as much reason for recognising 'Tien' as cognate to 'Tiu,' the meaning being the same, as Mr. Max Müller has to bring 'Tien' into relation with 'Dyaus.' It is true that Mr. Max Müller (p. 194) says that 'Tien' was 'originally the name for the sky;' but that seems a somewhat gratuitous assertion, seeing that he tells us further on that 'it is compounded of two signs, "ta," which means great, and "yih," which means one.'* Equally gratuitous appears to me the statement at p. 206: 'Everywhere these words begin with the meaning sky, they *rise* to the meaning of god, and they sink down again to the meaning of gods and spirits.' The

* Those who trace our origin through evolution to the ape should have some theory which accounts for these notions. If our descent is from the ape, and there is merely the canopy above us and nothing more, how have we got ideas which transcend not only ourselves and the canopy, but which reach to the Supreme Creator beyond it? If He does not exist, how did we come to invent Him? But what shall we think of the theory of evolution if we find these notions or ideas among a people whom history compels us to place among the most ancient, and whom linguistically the evolutionists would class among the most primitive of our race?

It may be worth while, then, to note that this evidence regarding the Chinese is not produced now for the first time, but this was the testimony also of the earliest Catholic missionaries. My attention has been directed by Mr. Charles Weld to *Vestiges des Prin. Dogmes Chrétiens tirés des anciens Livres Chinois*, par le P. de Premare, S.J., traduits par Messrs. Bonnetty et P. Perny (Paris, 1878), from which I make the following extracts, omitting the Chinese type: 'Que par les mots chinois "Tien" et "Chang-ty" . . . les anciens livres designent le Dieu vivant et véritable, c'est ce qu'a affirmé autrefois le P. Math. Ricci [Père Ricci landed in China in 1583; Père Premare b. 1666, d. 1734] et aucun Chinois, après avoir lu son livre . . . ne l'a jamais accusé de s'être trompé ni d'avoir mal compris les anciens livres' (p. 55). Extracts are given in translation, and also from the Chinese text of the Chou-king, Chi-king, and from the works of Confucius, Mencius, and other Chinese authorities. M. Bonnetty, the learned Directeur des Annales de Phil. Chrétienne, however, adds a note (p. 58): 'Le Père Premare nous semble oublier la plus belle preuve que le "Tien" est la plus exacte définition de Dieu. En effet ce caractère est composé de "ta"=*grand*, et de "y"=*un*, en sorte qu'en mettant ce caractère un au-dessus du caractère *grand*, ou seul grand, ou grand unique; il est impossible de mieux designer Dieu.' See also analogous testimony in the Rev. H. Formby's *Monotheism the Primitive Religion of Rome*, e.g. p. 202.

Scripture and the tradition of mankind assert the contrary of this; and while there is nothing in the facts adduced which compels the belief that the knowledge of God did not antecede their identification of His name with the sky, which on the other hand is likely enough to have happened in the initiatory, it may be in the first stages of degeneracy. There is in the derivation of the name distinct, if not conclusive, evidence of the priority of the application of the name to God. The contrary is only assumed upon the scientific theory, conjecture, hallucination, belief, or shibboleth—call it what you will—that the law of the world is a law of progress, and that man must necessarily have advanced by stages from the lower to the higher grades.

It is a strange theory of progress, however, which makes men advance exactly to the point where they identify God with the sky, and then retrogress into barbarism.

II. The second corroboration of Scripture, and more particularly with reference to the dispersion which I shall adduce, is the manner in which the conclusions of philology are broadly stated, after an induction which has now embraced all the habitable parts of the world; and when I say broadly stated, I do not intend, as so stated by this or that philosopher, but according to the permanent and essential conditions of the statement. I will again recur to the pages of Mr. Max Müller:

'People wonder why the students of language have not succeeded in establishing more than three families of speech—or rather two, for the Turanian can hardly be called a family, in the strict sense of that word, until it has been fully proved that Chinese forms the centre of the two Turanian branches—the North Turanian on one side, and the South Turanian on the other. . . . The reason why scholars have discovered no more than these two or three great families of speech is very simple. There were *no more*, and *we cannot make more*. Families of language are very peculiar formations; they are and must be the exception, not the rule, in the growth of language' (p. 160).

This accords exactly with the statements of the Bible, that men were once of one tongue; that in consequence of a certain project—to wit, the building of the Tower of Babel—their speech was confounded; and that, as is traditionally inferred, the corruption and spirit of insubordination which led to this catastrophe were especially rife in one of the three aboriginal families of mankind, and in the one which was not the Semitic nor the Aryan (Japhetic), the two families of speech to which Mr. Max Müller refers.* If we suppose their tongues to have been confounded according to the measure and degree of their offence, we shall have anticipated it according to the lines indicated; and the conclusions of philology reveal precisely the state of things we should, *à priori*, have expected to find. We might, perhaps, further conjecture that the miraculous confusion of tongues was according to families, and the dialectic difference within the families the result only of the natural laws which it is the province of philology to trace.

If the science of tradition had its professors and students, Mr. Max Müller, after having said,

‘We have, I think, sufficient witnesses to establish that there was a period during which the ancestors of the Semitic family had not yet been divided in language and religion,’

would hardly have ventured to add,

‘That period transcends the recollection of every one of the Semitic races, in the same way as neither Hindoos, Greeks, nor Romans have any recollection of the time when they spoke a common language, and worshipped their Father in heaven by a name that was as yet neither Sanskrit, nor Greek, nor Latin;’

* In *Tradition*, &c., p. 39, I have said, ‘Behind these various systems, as behind a grill, we seem to see the forms and faces of the progenitors of the human race discernible, but their existence not capable of contact and actual demonstration, because of the intercepting bars and lattice-work. If space allowed, I think the traditional lines might be indicated as plainly from the philological as from the ethnological point of view.’

and thus thrust aside the very definite traditions of the confusion of tongues, and the Dispersion among the Hebrews (Semitic), among the Hindoos, Persians, and Greeks (Aryan),—*vide* Luken (ii. ch. iv.), who, however, strangely omits allusion to the *μερόπων ἀνθρώπων* of Hesiod,*—scattered traditions in America, and the remarkable tradition of the Chaldeans† (Hamitic). It is true the testimony of the tablets has been disentombed since the publication of Mr. Max Müller's Lectures; yet the testimony of Abydenus and Polyhistor, although at that time doubtful, and at best secondhand, still carried with them a certain internal evidence of authenticity, which, if Mr. Max Müller's attention had been directed to them, might have obtained recognition.

III. We shall now enter upon fresh ground, although it may be in the end only to come back to the same point—the tower in the plain of Babylon, and the dispersion of the human race.

Before finally leaving the ground I have hitherto gone over, I may perhaps be allowed to say in retrospect, that if all these races and families are separately shown to have once had the same worship and same language; if, more-

* Elton translates this phrase 'many-languaged man,' and the word *μεροψ* imports divided speech. If in the sense merely of articulate speech, the phrase is pointless. I may observe, moreover, that when it is used in Hesiod (*Weeks and Days*, v. 109), and again in Homer (*Iliad*, xi. 27), it is in connection with statements which we should consider to have traditional reference to this very period, *i.e.* the gold and iron age and the rainbow.

† The following transcripts of the tablets, in fragmentary form, such as they unfortunately exist, will show the nature of this testimony: '2, . . . of him, his heart was evil; 3, against the father of all the gods was wicked; 4, . . . of him his heart was evil; 5, . . . Babylon brought to subjection; 6, [small] and great He confounded their speech (these verses repeated); 9, their strong place (tower) all the day they founded; 10, to their strong place in the night; 11, entirely he made an end; 12, in His anger. . . 14, he gave this command, their counsel was confused . . . the course he broke . . . fixed the sanctuary.' Mr. G. Smith's *Chaldean Account of Genesis*, pp. 160, 161. *Vide* further evidence, Appendix C.

over, it is shown that they had a common tradition, that this tradition tells of events extending not to themselves only, but to the whole human race ; if these histories and traditions commence with these very events, or some of them ; if their chronologies, upon analysis, bring them back to the same epoch ; and if one of these histories, which holds together by its intrinsic evidence, plainly, fully, and distinctly states as the fact what we might otherwise have indirectly inferred from the evidence, is not that history, in the absence of any evidence, although the world has been ransacked to contradict its statements* and subvert its authority, entitled to be called the history, and its statements, taken in connection with the dispersed evidence, the tradition, of the human race ?

But if, besides the traditions already referred to, we find others that carry with them astronomical indications which determine them approximatively to a certain date, and if this date corresponds with the chronology of Holy Writ, within the limits which we may regard as fixed, may we not begin to ask what kind of evidence is deficient ? We shall have had as the result of the induction from the comparison of natural ' religions,' of the induction from

* ' It is indeed inconceivable that, if the biblical history, covering the space of time which it does, and dealing as it does with the affairs of most of the great nations of antiquity, were a fictitious narrative, modern historical science, with its searching methods and its exact and extended knowledge of the past, should not have, long ere this, demonstrated the fact, and completely overthrown the historical authority of the sacred volume. But it is not even pretended that this has been done. Attacks have been made on this or that portion of the records, on names and numbers and minute expressions which it is contended are inaccurate ; but no one pretends to show, as it should be easy to show, if the history is not true, that it is irreconcilably at variance with the course of mundane events as known to us from other sources. The progress of our knowledge has indeed tended very remarkably of late years in the opposite direction. . . The more exact the knowledge that we obtain by discovery or critical research of the remote past, the closer the agreement that we find between profane and biblical history.' *Historical Illustrations of the Old Testament*, by the Rev. G. Rawlinson.

the comparison of languages, and as the induction from the traditions interwoven with astronomy, which we are now proceeding to examine, that mankind, or large sections of mankind, and mankind inferentially, before they passed into a greater or less state of isolation and separation, were united, or at any rate in communication or contact.

For the testimony which astronomy is capable doubtless of supplying, if we can extort it, I shall principally rely upon the evidence which Mr. R. A. Proctor has lately brought together in illustration of the traditional character of the constellations.

I regret to say that Mr. Proctor does not believe, as we do, in the Deluge, or in the subsequent dispersion of mankind.

I am going to show that Mr. Proctor's *facts* prove that the constellations were named, or at any rate known by their present names, at an epoch which would correspond with the Dispersion. This, however, is not Mr. Proctor's *view*. Mr. Proctor believes (p. 431),*

'That the actual order in this and other cases was the reverse of this [the traditional view], and that men imagined certain figures in the heavens, pictured these figures in their astronomical temples or observatories, and made stories afterwards to fit the pictures, probably many generations afterwards.'

Having stated Mr. Proctor's theory so that I think there will be no possibility of misconception, I will take the liberty of bringing together his statements, in such a manner that they may be regarded from our point of view.

Mr. Proctor's standpoint is that, owing to the alteration of the earth's position, regarding the constellations through what is called precessional motion [the description by the pole of the earth of a circle which it takes 25,868 years to complete] since the time when the con-

* 'The Origin of the Constellation Figures,' *Belgravia*, Oct. 1877.

stellations were first named, 'a vacant space has been left in the heavens, unoccupied by any constellation.' This vacant space (in the region of the south pole) is measurable, and its measure gives the time when the last southern constellation, the traditional name of which has come down to us, stood on the horizon. In this way we get both the epoch when it so stood, and the latitude from which it was thus seen.

'We may be sure,' says Mr. Proctor, pp. 420, 421, 'not to be led very far astray; for we are not guided by one constellation, but by several; whereas all the other indications that have been followed depend on the supposed ancient position of single constellations. . . . Now it is a matter of no difficulty whatever to determine the epoch when the southern pole of the heavens was thus placed . . . at the centre of the vacant space of the star-sphere, or rather of the space free from constellations.'

And he places it between 2100 and 2200 B.C.

This period will sufficiently accord with the scriptural epoch of the Dispersion. 200 or 300 years would hardly cause any such displacement of the constellations as would materially affect, so as to preclude the argument. All that the astronomical fact decides is, that mankind had this knowledge and nomenclature in common before the date named. It is only an inference that the constellations were named at that date.

Let us now take the evidence as to the latitude of the people by whom 'the constellations were first named,' or I should rather say, who called these groups of stars by the appellations current at the epoch, which the vacant space enables us to determine.

'Whatever the first astronomers were, however profound their knowledge of astronomy may have been (as some imagine), they had certainly not travelled far enough towards the south to know the constellations around the south pole' (p. 419). 'The southern pole, now eccentrically placed amid the region where there were no constellations in old times, was once differently situated. But the cir-

cumstance which seems to have been overlooked is this, that by calculating backwards to the time when the southern pole was in the centre of that vacant region, we have a much better chance of finding the date (let us rather say the century) when the older constellations were formed than by any other process.'

Vide continuation of the passage *supra*, p. 88; and also the latitude, at p. 436. Mr. Proctor continues:

'Let us consider how this theory accords with the result to which we were led by the great vacant space round the southern pole. So far as the date is concerned, we have already seen that the epoch (2170 B.C.) accords excellently with the evidence of the vacant space. But this evidence, as I mentioned at the outset, establishes more than the date: it indicates the latitude of the place where the most ancient of Ptolemy's forty-eight constellations were first definitely adopted by astronomers. If we assume that at this place the southernmost constellations were first fully seen when due south, we find for the latitude about 38 degrees north. . . . The station of the astronomers who founded the new system can scarcely have been more than a degree or two north of this latitude. On the other side, we may go a little farther; for by so doing we only raise the constellations somewhat higher above the southern horizon, to which there is less objection than to a change thrusting part of the constellations below the horizon. Still it may be doubted whether the place where the constellations were first formed was less than 22 or 23 degrees north of the equator.* The Great Pyramid, as we know, is about 30 degrees north of the equator; but we also know that its architects travelled southwards to find a suitable place for it. One of their objects may well have been to obtain a fuller view of the star-sphere south of their constellations. I think from 35 to 39 degrees north would be about the most probable limits, and from 32 to 41 degrees north the certain limits, of the station of the first founders of solar zodiacal astronomy. What their actual station may have been is not so easily established. Some think the region lay between the sources of the Oxus (Amoor) and Indus; others think that the station of these astronomers was not very far from Mount Ararat—a view to which I was led long ago by other considerations, discussed in the first appendix to my treatise on *Saturn and its System*.'

I have more than once referred to the vacant space:

* 'These 15 or 16 degrees include very nearly the whole course of the Euphrates, the Tigris, and the Ganges, the whole of Syria, nearly the whole of Persia, the larger part of Arabia, and the whole of Egypt as now bounded.'—E. R.

'This great space' (p. 419) 'surrounds the southern pole of the heavens; and this shows that the first observers of the stars were not acquainted with the constellations, which can be seen only from places far south of Chaldæa, Persia, Egypt, India, China, and, indeed, of all the regions to which the invention of astronomy has been assigned.'

I should like this last paragraph read in connection with an extract which I have given from Dr. Newman's 'Inaugural Discourse,' on the course of the stream of civilisation, and its geographical lines and limits, in *Tradition*, p. 338.

It must be confessed, I think, that the above astronomical conclusions approximate very closely to the lines of the sacred narrative, both as to the epoch when the constellations were named or renamed, and as to the latitude where the men who so named them must have dwelt.

It remains for us to examine the constellations themselves. Mr. Proctor reminds us that the constellations have altered in their position and configuration traditionally, and absolutely also, it is conjectured, and that is the one point which astronomers would care to ascertain as the result of the inquiry.

At the period to which we revert, B.C. 2000,

'The Centaur' (as seen in Egypt, Chaldæa, India, &c.) 'stood then . . . upon the horizon itself. In latitude 20 degrees or so north he may still be seen thus placed when due south. The Centaur was represented in old times as placing an offering upon the altar, which was pictured, says Manilius, as bearing a fire of incense, represented by stars. This, to a student of our modern charts, seems altogether perplexing. . . . Aratus tells us that the celestial Centaur was placing an offering upon the altar, which was therefore upright; and Manilius describes the altar as

"Ferens thuris, stellis imitantibus, ignem;"

so that the fire was where it should be—on the top of an upright altar, where also, on the sky itself, were stars, looking like the smoke from incense fires. Now that was precisely the appearance pre-

sented by the stars forming the constellation at the time I have indicated, some 2170 years B.C.' (p. 423).

Similar instances of displacement are traced in the representations of Draco, the Great Bear, 'the great ship Argo,' and Ophiuchus :

'Some imagine that a sculptured representation of these imagined figures in the heavens may have been interpreted and expanded into the narrative of a contest between the man and the old serpent, the dragon, Ophiuchus the serpent-bearer being supposed to typify the eventual defeat of the dragon. This fancy might be followed out like that relating to the Deluge; but the reader has possibly no desire for further inquiries in that particular direction.'

But you, who are the reader on the present occasion, have not become acquainted with this theory of the Deluge, which I have reserved. Whilst sifting the chaff from the grain, I will ask you not to isolate the latter from the evidence elsewhere accumulated. At p. 424 Mr. Proctor writes :

'There are those who imagine that this great ship (Argo) represented the ark, its fore-part formerly being the portion of the Centaur now forming the horse, so that the Centaur was represented as a man (not as a man-horse) offering a gift on the altar.* Thus in this group of constellations men recognised the ark, and Noah going up from the ark towards the altar. . . . One heretic has even imagined that the constellation-figures of the ship, the man with an offering and the altar, painted and sculptured in some ancient astrological temple, came at a later date to be understood as picturing a certain series of events, interpreted and expanded by a poetical writer into a complete narrative. Without venturing to advocate here so heterodox a notion, I may remark as an odd coincidence that probably such a picture or sculpture would have shown the smoke ascending from the altar, which I have already described, and in this smoke there would be shown the bow of Sagittarius. This interpreted and expanded in the way I have mentioned might

* In illustration of this remark and what has been said at pp. 88, 89; comp., I may mention that the principal Maori constellation is called 'the Canoe of Tamarere' (*vide* Taylor's *New Zealand*, p. 363), although the stern is formed of the stars of Orion's belt.

have accounted for the "bow set in the clouds for a token of a covenant." It is noteworthy that all the remaining constellations forming the southern limit of the old star-domes or charts were watery ones—the southern fish, over which Aquarius is pouring a quite unnecessary stream of water; the great sea-monster, towards which in turn flow the streams of the river Eridanus; . . . the great sea-serpent Hydra. . . . On the back of Hydra is the raven, which again may be supposed by those who accept the theory mentioned above to have suggested the raven which went forth to and fro from the ark. He is close enough to the rigging of Argo to make an easy journey of it. The dove, however, must not be confounded with the modern constellation Columba, though this is placed (suitably enough) near the ark. We must suppose the idea of the dove was suggested by a bird pictured in the rigging of the celestial ship. The sequence in which the constellations came above the horizon as the year went round corresponded very satisfactorily with the theory, fanciful though it may be. First, Aquarius pouring streams of water, the three fishes (Pisces and Pisces Australis) and the great sea-monster Cetus, showing how the waters prevailed over the highest hills; then the ark sailing on the waters; a little later the raven (Corvus); the man descending from the ark, and offering a gift on the altar; and at last the bow set amid the clouds. The theory just described may have little in its favour. But wilder theories of the story of the Deluge have been adopted and advocated with considerable confidence. One of the wildest, I fear, is the Astronomer-Royal's, that the Deluge was simply a great rising of the Nile.'

Let us separate as well as we may the facts from the theory.

We shall have to decide, in the first place, whether these constellations, besides being created in their places in the heavens, have been preordained to the configurations we see depicted on our charts, and are thus necessarily determined to the resemblance of a bear, a lion, a raven, or a serpent; or whether they are only accidentally conformed to these likenesses; or whether the resemblances are purely subjective in the beholder.

Although Mr. Proctor allows that we must 'make-believe a great deal,' yet it would seem that the first view is involved in Mr. Proctor's *theory* (i.e. theory of the

Deluge as distinct from his scheme of the constellations), otherwise there is nothing to account for their being so placed in the first instance in the zodiacal temples.

That these may be accidental resemblances, though hardly to the extent of covering the whole ground of argument, may be conceded from either of our respective points of view—the view to which I incline being that the resemblances were mainly subjective in the early beholders, who lived, however, at the epoch indicated by Mr. Proctor, and who at that date must have agreed upon a nomenclature of the stars which was traditionally held—not without much displacement and substitution, however, by the generations which followed them.

I should venture to contend that the evidence corresponds with the latter surmise rather than with the former. There is much in the mode in which the zodiacal figures are depicted by the various nations to warrant the belief that they must once have been held in common; and yet there is not such absolute agreement as we should expect if the constellations in the heavens presented the same configuration to every eye.*

The correspondence in the signs of the zodiac throughout a great part of the world is remarkable; but this has to be discriminated. 'It is true,' says Goguet, who has discussed this matter very carefully, 'that at this time the Arabians, Moguls (India), the Tartars, and almost all the people of the East, design the signs of the zodiac by the same names with us. But we know that all these

* The stars being fixed, they would indeed present, more or less, the same configuration to every eye, when once the grouping was agreed to; the groups, however, would not necessarily suggest the same fancy to every imagination. The correspondence in configuration might have sufficed for the purposes of nomenclature. I agree with Mr. Proctor, that the position of a group at a particular time, *e.g.* its appearance on the horizon, would tend to fix it in a determinate way in recollection. This would be particularly the case in times when, as Mr. Lockyer tells us, the horizon was the principal instrument of observation.

nations except the Chinese adopted the astronomy of the Greeks' (Goguet, 'Dissertation on the Names and Figures of the Constellations,' *Origin of Laws*, ii.).* The extent to which the Greeks caused their astronomy to prevail may be questionable; but Goguet anticipates the reply which goes most directly to the point, viz.

'That the Greeks did not invent astronomy; they learned it from the Chaldeans, the Phœnicians, and the Egyptians;' and that 'it may be presumed that they would have retained the names and figures which these people had given to the constellations; and thus the tradition of the primitive customs would have been transmitted to us. This objection is not difficult to be answered. Although the Greeks were incontestably indebted to the Chaldeans and Egyptians, &c., they had, nevertheless, strangely altered the symbols by which these people had designed the constellations. The Greeks had formed a particular zodiac.'

In speaking of Greece we must have regard to her geographical position, and to the large section of the circle through which she drew in tradition; and in the end it is these 'invented' or imported symbols of the Greeks which are the very symbols which have just struck us as so significant and traditional in the pages of Mr. Proctor.

If, then, the Indian, Arab, &c., received their zodiac from the Greeks, the Greeks had formed it, or, if they invented, based their invention upon the tradition originally drawn from these and other Oriental people. It only comes to this, that tradition has gone round in a circle—as Alban Butler said of ladies' fashions, 'like the spokes

* If I am asked why I quote so antiquated an authority as Goguet, I answer that I have found his treatise at the base of everything that has been written since, and that little has been added to our knowledge. The new edition of the *Encyclopædia Britannica* altogether ignores the question, *sub voce* Constellations. The above remark, however, must not be supposed to be applied to Sir G. C. Lewis's *Astronomy of the Ancients* or to Mr. Proctor's works, but it is convenient to me to quote an authority outside them.

of a wheel,' returning upon the very ones which had displaced them.

If, then, tradition has run its cycle, there can be little doubt that there has been abundant opportunity for interchange, amalgamation, and substitution ; for which astronomical reasons also can be assigned, as, for instance, in the confusion of the zodiacal symbols with those of the northern and southern hemispheres.

The surprise, therefore, is that anything primitive should have survived ; and if there had not been always a substratum of tradition, and the course of things had happened exactly in the manner supposed ; if the Greeks had drawn purely upon their imagination, and had found a *tabula rasa* on which to write their invention,—we should have anticipated anything rather than that the symbols of their invention should fall exactly into the lines of the diluvian tradition.

The coincidences, moreover, which have been discovered on the American continent—and which are not a little remarkable—would seem certainly to prove that some of the symbols were primitive. Goguet says, 'The Iroquois knew "Ursa Major." They called it "Okonari," *i.e.* a bear.' Goguet's reason is, 'that the constellation was always seen by the ancient astronomers to the north, and the bear was the most remarkable animal in the northern countries.' This may be true, although it supposes the families of mankind who named the constellations to have explored the North previously to the epoch at which the constellations were named between the fifteen or sixteen degrees as above, although Mr. Proctor's argument establishes that they had not gone beyond a stated latitude to the south, which might presumably be inferred also for their exploration to the north. If, however, we may not argue the matter from our own or Mr. Proctor's point of view, then Goguet's suggestion will be an explanation for

the Iroquois only, and will not explain the coincidence of the Iroquois having the same name for the constellation which we find general throughout the centre of civilisation. It will be, perhaps, best to mention here that in Dr. Schliemann's Catalogue, plate xxix. p. 379 (*b*), the Great Bear is represented in a 'prehistoric' 'whorl' in a constellation group found at Troy.

Goguet's reference, as above, is to Père Lafitau, a very competent authority, for he had spent five years in the Indian missions, and recorded the experiences of Père Julian Garnier, who had spent a still longer time in the mission, and was well acquainted with the Iroquois and Huron, as well as with the Algonquin, dialects. As Lafitau's work (1724) is rare, I will translate at some length. At p. 235 Lafitau says :

'The Iroquois called the stars "Otsistok," a fire in the water, . . . which seems to make allusion to the waters which the Holy Scripture says were above the firmament. . . . They have divided them into constellations; and it is curious that some of these constellations and some of the planets have the same name that we have received from antiquity. They call Venus or the morning star, "Te Onentenhaonitha," she carries the day; which has the same signification as the name of "Lucifer," which the ancients have handed down to us. They call the Pleiades "Te Tennonniakona," les danseurs et les danseuses, which would appear to have some foundation in antiquity, according to what Hyginus* tells us, who says they are so named because they seem to lead a round dance by the arrangement of their stars.'

Query, because the Pleiades led off the dance or the revolution of the stars with the commencement of the year, which, although not the fact now or *when* the Iroquois thus spoke his impressions or traditions, *was* the fact at the period when we believe mankind to have been in the regions of Mesopotamia; for Mr. Proctor tells us (p. 487) 'at the epoch indicated the first constellation of the zodiac

* Hyginus, lib. ii. art. Taurus, &c.

was not, as now, the Fishes, nor, as when a fresh departure was made by Hipparchus, the Ram, *but the Bull*, a trace of which is found in Virgil's words,

‘Candidus auratis aperit cum cornibus annum
Taurus.’

The Bull, then, was the spring sign, the Pleiades joining their rays with the sun's at the time of the vernal equinox.' Lafitau continues :

‘I have already remarked that they call the Milky Way “the road of souls,” and I have shown the connection which this name has with the doctrine of the ancients on the state of souls, on their celestial origin and their return to heaven.’

An analogy may be seen in the Polynesian songs descriptive of migration after death (*vide* W. Gill's *Myths and Songs*, pp. 158, 164). There is no absolute necessity which compels the description of this noticeable dispersion of light in the heavens as a roadway or even as a river, which is more in similitude; yet one or other of these would appear to be the traditional description. Goguet says (ii. p. 400), ‘The long white train which traverses the whole heavens has received also among most nations a denomination very conformable to the object which it represents. The Greeks have called it “Galaxy” or “Milky Way,” on account of its whiteness. The Chinese call it “Tien-ho,” the celestial river. Many nations call it the “great road.” The savages of North America design it by the name of the “road of souls.” The peasants in France call it “the road of St. James.”’ But can this ‘long white’ stretch of light be truly said to be comparable to anything in any more definite sense than it can be said to be the nucleus for comparison with everything? It is not so continuous as to preclude its being broken into parts; and of any part we might say, as Polonius might say, ‘It is very like a whale,’ as like a whale as Cetus is; or in its extension it might be as aptly likened

to a serpent, and with an outline sufficiently indefinite to take Saurian or Plesiosaurian forms.

Lafitau says of their word 'Okonari,' or Bear, for the constellation which we also so call:

'It is very certain that the Iroquois, and most of the savages, know the Great Bear under the same name that we do. . . . There is no reason to believe that they have given it this name since Europeans landed on their shores. It is certainly a very ancient name among them.'

They agree with Mr. Proctor in ridiculing the configuration which gives the three stars as a long tail to the bear. The name of Bear applied to the constellation is at any rate as old as Homer, *Iliad*, l. 18, v. 487; although in the *Odyssey*, l. 5, v. 273 (Goguet, ii. p. 606), the constellation is called the Chariot; and, by the bye, it must be presumed that those who called it the Bear, and those who called it the Chariot or the Plough, equally saw these objects in the sky. It is, I believe, generally considered that the Bear is the more ancient appellation. Job (ix. 9) is supposed to indicate this constellation in the star he terms Asch; and it is certain he intends an animal (Goguet, i. 396). It would appear, then, that there is some evidence that the original descriptions and designations of the more conspicuous and more traditional constellations were retained. The Bear is an instance of the first, the Bull (Taurus) of the second.

I have shown reason ('*The Nature Myth*' *Theory untenable from the Scriptural Point of View*, p. 8) for believing that the Aryan race had the sign Taurus in tradition, in connection with the Deluge, as I believe also had the Chaldean and the Greek. The sign of the Bull was conspicuous in the zodiac—at any rate, was second in the table of months among the Chaldeans and the Hebrews (Lenormant's *Fragmens Cosmogoniques de Berosé*, 1871, p. 211). Whatever is proved of the Pleiades seems, in a

manner, proved also of the sign Taurus, and we have just seen a common traditional name applied to them by the Greeks and American Indians. There is, however, still more direct evidence as to the sign Taurus in American tradition. Gognet says (ii. p. 400) :

‘The nations who dwell along the river Amazon called the Hyades (in the Bull) “Tapiira Rayouba,” a name which signifies, at this time, in their language, the *chops of the ox*.’ ‘Relation de la Rivière des Amazones,’ par M. de la Condamine, dans les *Mém. de l’Acad. des Sciences*, ann. 1745, M. p. 447.

M. de la Condamine adds :

‘The word signified formerly the chops of the Tapiira, an animal proper to the country; but since European cattle have been transported into America, the Brazilians and Peruvians have applied to these animals the names which they gave in their mother-tongue to the *largest* quadrupeds they knew before the coming of the Europeans.’

Let us now go to the archipelago, which is one line of connection between Europe and America. M. A. Fornander, in his *Origin and Migration of the Polynesian Race* (Trübner, 1878), a work compiled from various sources, based upon the experiences of a ‘thirty-four years’ residence in the Hawaiian group’ (i. p. 119), says :

‘In the Hawaiian group the red star in the constellation is called Kao—the star Antares in the horns of the bull was also called Makalii. That the ancient Hawaiians should have called the constellation of the Bull, Taurus, by the very name which was one of the earliest appellations for that animal while the Aryan stock was yet unsundered, is one of those quiet but surprising witnesses to the Western origin and Aryan connection of the Polynesian family, which,’ &c.

And it is curious, and I am surprised that M. Fornander has not remarked it from this point of view, that (*vide* p. 125) Makalii commences the Hawaiian table of months. [Makalii seems to have something cognate to

‘Kimah,’ the word which Job is believed to apply to the Hyades in this constellation (the Bull). Goguet, i. p. 398.]

Let me notice what strikes me as another coincidence. ‘The *first* constellation of the Chinese zodiac, called Kio [query, cognate to Kimah, as above], which means a *horn*, is only composed of one star’ (Goguet, ii. p. 397). Goguet cites this in evidence of diversity, and not of resemblance. Read, however, in juxtaposition with the other instances I have adduced, remembering [*e.g.* in the Polynesian tradition as above, also in the Indian] that the star which marks the point of the horn—that is, the very point of commencement—has been specially noted and named; bearing in mind that the Chinese are monosyllabic in their language and simple in their ideas, I think we may regard this name, or hieroglyphic, as a sign which sufficiently identifies the star with the constellation Taurus. Before leaving this ground I will mention that M. Fornander, at p. 46, gives an astronomical indication which, apart from the more direct traditions of the Polynesians, seems to prove that they came from a northern latitude to the tropics. The Maui legend tells that formerly the Tahitans at one time mourned the prolonged absence of the sun, but that Maui regulated its course so as to make day and night equal; from which M. Fornander infers that ‘they formerly lived in a zone where the inequality of day and night was greater than in the tropics.’

This will lead us back to the consideration of Mr. Proctor’s view.

It has therefore somehow occurred that, at some period, the imagination of mankind, or of an influential section of mankind—of those men, whoever they were, who gave the names to the constellations which are still current—has seen in the heavens resemblances to terrestrial objects.

These terrestrial objects, moreover, are strangely connected with remarkable human events—or, I will rather say, with events which a large part of mankind, regarded collectively, believe explicitly, and which, if the theory of *Tradition* is true, the mass of mankind distributively believe implicitly to have occurred.

If these events really occurred they must, *ex hypothesi*, have affected all mankind, and must materially have influenced the course of human history. This is so true that, as I have pointed out in *Tradition*, p. 242, Boulanger, the friend and correspondent of Voltaire, was so dominated by the idea of the Deluge that he made its consequences the foundation of all his theories. It is not, therefore, an unreasonable assumption that if the catastrophe occurred, the tradition of it would have survived.

Accordingly, more particularly when Mr. Proctor tells us it is so, it does not surprise us to hear that the stars are so fixed in groups, and arranged in so natural and intimate a connection and sequence with the incidents of the principal event referred to, viz. the universal Deluge, that Mr. Proctor, from his own point of view, has been able to start a theory which we shall still further consider, and which I need not say is the reverse of that which I imply, and supposes that from the sequence of the constellations so depicted in temples mankind subsequently made stories to fit the pictures; or, in Mr. Proctor's words, 'that men imagined certain figures in the heavens, pictured these figures in their astronomical temples and observatories, and made stories afterwards to fit the pictures, probably many generations afterwards' (p. 481).

No clue is suggested to the mystery how the imagination of man came to arrange the figures into these groups in the first instance.

Mr. Proctor's testimony, therefore, is only or mainly

valuable in attestation that the figures corresponding to the events of the Deluge have at some time been placed in the heavens; and that these are the figures which have, so to speak, come down to us in the main stream of tradition. Now if there were no other evidence, no prior independent traditional evidence, that the Deluge was an historical event, or if, on the other hand, Mr. Proctor were able to show that the constellations have necessarily been determined to the groups and forms which he describes, Mr. Proctor's theory might be allowed to stand. Mr. Proctor's astronomical facts of course are one thing, and Mr. Proctor's theory quite another thing. The latter reposes at present upon mere conjecture.

Moreover, it is essential to his position that these constellations should at some time have been represented in an astronomical temple before the delusion of the Deluge (as he might say) was propagated among mankind. Mr. Proctor does not tell us where this temple may be seen. The question of these zodiacal temples is not now mooted for the first time. I had thought that it had been set at rest in Cardinal Wiseman's eighth lecture on *Science and Revealed Religion*. All we can say is that if any zodiacal temples are known besides those of Dendera and Esnah (respectively of the age of Tiberius and Antoninus) they ought not to remain among the *arcana* of science.

I must press this point further. Is it to be supposed that there was one such temple or that there were several such temples? Looking to the diffusion of the diluvian tradition, we should seem to require for Mr. Proctor's theory as many temples as there are lines of tradition. The completeness of the theory, however, would be better satisfied with one such temple. This, however, supposes that the different families of mankind were once in contact. The astronomical date which Mr. R. A. Proctor's

calculation has fixed brings us approximatively to the period which the Bible indicates when implying the same set of facts.

We may, on the other hand, start upon the supposition that we each assume the basis of our argument—we assuming that human history commences with the Deluge; Mr. Proctor that there were certain prehistoric zodiacal temples. Now theory against theory, is it more probable that the survivors of so dire a calamity as a universal deluge, within a few centuries of the event (taking Mr. Proctor's date, B.C. 2170),* before the catastrophe could have died out of recollection—and it must long have strangely influenced and overcast their imagination—should have located the objects which were so present to their minds in the heaven, or that men in whose history these events had had no occurrence should have evolved this naturally repellent history out of their consciousness in dreamy speculation, whilst gazing at the zodiacal representation on the dome of some temple?

Mr. Proctor's theory, however, is in no way tenable until he has destroyed the basis of Genesis, unless he is prepared to assert and expects us to believe that Genesis also was the idealised transcript of a planisphere. Even if the intrinsic evidence is not allowed to impress us, and if the scriptural narrative does not strike us as too grave and solemn in its statements, and too traditional in form and expression to make it credible that it was evolved

* The Babylonians counted their stellar observations from B.C. 2234 (*vide* Rawlinson's *Ancient Monarchies*, i. 192), which very nearly corresponds with Mr. Proctor's calculated date, B.C. 2170. These figures again approximate very closely to the figures arrived at for the commencement of the earliest historical reigns in Mr. W. Palmer's discrimination of the mythical from the historical years in the Old Chronicle (Egyptian), and in Berosus' list. Mr. Palmer says (ii. 940), as the result of his analysis, 'The apparent commencement of the Chaldean kings will be B.C. 2209, . . . just twenty-two years lower than the apparent epoch of Menes, B.C. 2224.'

out of any individual consciousness, I contend that the historical evidence, taken in connection with the astronomical indications, must be decisive.

Genesis gravely records the universal Deluge as an event in human history; and Genesis, assuming (*vide* evidence and argument in Rev. W. Smith's *The Pentateuch*) Moses to have been the author, would have been *circa* B.C. 1800. If the internal evidence repels the idea that the writer of Genesis evolved it out of his own consciousness, he must then have recorded an event which was evolved from his inner consciousness by some one else, between his own date, B.C. 1800, and Mr. Proctor's astronomical date, B.C. 2170.

The record of events in Genesis between the respective dates might stand on its internal evidence.

I prefer, however, to reply that a similar record of events has recently been discovered in Assyria. Here too the latest date that can be assigned is *circa* B.C. 1700-1500, and this was a time when there was no probability of contact (as their separate records negatively vouch) between the Hebrew and the Chaldean. Here too the zodiacal signs must have been first of all invented, and then forgotten, and then idealised into this strange history of the Deluge between the above dates, B.C. 2170 and 1500; and these transitions must have taken place among a people and in a region where there is abundant evidence of tenacity in tradition.

In each case, *i.e.* of the Hebrew and Chaldean, the processes of evolution from the inner consciousness must have been separate and distinct, and yet identical in the result; and this from their point of view, as I have already observed, supposes a parallel succession of fortuitous coincidences.

I am unable to perceive upon what other lines Mr. Proctor's theory can proceed. If it fails, however, we must

still remain indebted to him for a valuable astronomical date.

We have then, I consider, boarded as it were three modern theories; and upon an examination of their papers discovered that their aim and intent were hostile to the scriptural narrative; and yet, upon following the tack of the vessel, we have in each case found ourselves, to our astonishment, in full sail backwards to the Diluvian period, and have left them in turn at a point where they were nearing the era of the Dispersion.

The inquiry might be indefinitely extended, and, as I have stated at the commencement, I have been constrained to exclude several ramifications of the same lines, even of the particular tradition I have been investigating: *e.g.* traditions of Paradise, the expectation of the Messiah, the golden age in connection with the Creation and the period following the Deluge, the longevity of primitive man, the Tower of Babel, and the commencement of almost every history with the distortion of some one of these or other scriptural events, the traditions of Noah in connection with the Dispersion, &c. Other considerations, however, have to be regarded, and among them the restricted measure of life now allotted to man; in fine, I must conclude.

I think I have shown that we are as much entitled to speak of a Science of Tradition as Mr. Max Müller is of a Science of Religion or of a Science of Language; and that the facts outside the Bible history afford as warrantable data for the verification of its statements as the basis of facts upon which the above-mentioned sciences rely; and although we may have no hope of convincing those who assume the theory of progress and the fact of initial barbarism, I shall not think that we have wasted our time if we have merely constructed foothold on the ground of science for those who believe, from which the partisans of

science—restricting this phrase to those only who make a religion of science—will perhaps find difficulty in dislodging them.

Yours very sincerely,

ARNDRELL OF WARDOUR.

IV.

Sept. 12, 1878.

MY DEAR ARUNDELL,

If you should hold to the idea of publishing your letters, as I hope you will do, for I think they constitute a valuable exposition and application of the Science of Tradition, it is but right that the lapse of time between the date of my receipt of your last letter and that of its publication—due to the state of physical and mental weakness I was suffering under when your letter reached me, so that it has only been quite lately that I have been able to read it, and apply what intelligence I may possess towards appreciating it—should be known as attributable to a cause over which you had no control. Otherwise it might be thought, looking only at the date of publication, that you might have noticed some later utterances of the group of scientists, with whose imaginative guesses you have concerned yourself.

Nothing, if I may add a few words of comment on the tactics of the materialists, or of those who, without affirming materialism explicitly, propound novel theories of the history of the human race, has struck me as more strangely unscientific—so alien to the spirit of the historical method—as the way in which a Book purporting to be a history of the human race, and of its origin—a Book accepted, not only as historical, but as written with divine assistance by the whole of Christendom, I might also add of Islam—is simply ignored.

As illustrations of this I will ask you to compare the following extract from Mr. Proctor's, in so many respects,

admirable article on 'the origin of the constellation figures,' with a few lines from Exodus: 'The use of the twenty-eight-day period naturally suggested the division of time into weeks of seven days each,' says Mr. Proctor.* 'In six days the Lord made heaven and earth, and the sea, and all things that are in them, and rested on the seventh day: therefore the Lord blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it,'† says Moses; or again, 'And He blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it.'‡

As further illustrating this putting out of sight adverse theories founded on the Scripture narrative, and ignoring conclusions in harmony with the sacred text, I observe that in the same article Mr. Proctor finds what he says has always seemed to him the great and overwhelming difficulty of accepting the belief that the year 2170 B.C. defines the beginning of exact astronomy to be this: 'That several of the circumstances insisted on as determining that date imply a considerable knowledge of astronomy.' Now this to me seems not only not a great and overwhelming difficulty, but no difficulty at all. I find in the sacred narrative, or, let us say, in the book of Genesis, received as authentic by Christendom, and confirmed as true by the authority of the Church, that 'Adam called all the beasts by their names, and all the fowls of the air, and all the cattle of the field.' Really it seems to me not difficult, but very easy, to imagine that if Adam, in his state of innocency and communion with God, knew enough of natural history to name the beasts, he might have known something of astronomy. In fact I make bold to guess, since guessing seems the fashion, that Adam, Noah, and Moses knew more of astronomy than Galileo, Kepler, Newton, the Astronomer-Royal, and Mr. Proctor rolled into one. Guess against guess, I hold it to be more in accordance with the

* *Belgravia*, No. 132, p. 432.

† Exodus xx. 11.

‡ Genesis ii. 3.

history of the human race, with observed phenomena, and with modern thought, excepting always the little corner occupied by the materialists, to suppose that we have rather lost than gained in the science of astronomy between say 2170 B.C. and our own era.

Common sense teaches and experience confirms the lesson that monuments and pictorial representations are the records of historical events, not the precursors of legends founded on them. No doubt but that, accepting Mr. Proctor's date for certain configurations of the constellations, the book of Genesis, of which Moses was the author or editor, was of later date than those configurations. But the question is not whether that particular part of the history in Genesis relating to the Deluge is founded on a fanciful interpretation of the pictures in the heavens; but whether, quite apart for the moment from the book of Genesis, the picture in the heavens was the occasion of the invention of a legend or the record of a precedent event. We do not want the configuration of the constellations to prove the fact of the Deluge; but if it be otherwise proved and a priority of date established on independent evidence, it seems a gratuitous offence against common sense to pretend that a picture, which may easily and naturally be read as a record, is a work of quite another kind—the foundation of an invented legend. Without the narrative of Moses we might well not be able to interpret the monuments of the Deluge or the customs and observances which attest it; but if his history explains the monuments, and gives a meaning to customs and observances, widely spread though not generally understood, which attest the event, it seems perversely unreasonable to imagine anything so contrary to usage as that the picture or monument came first and the history it seems to represent afterwards. On this system we might discredit the story of the lives of such men as Nel-

son and Wellington, as legends founded on the monuments or pictures of their achievements, or take the Column of the Place Vendôme as the foundation of the Napoleonic myth.

I have incidentally of late stumbled on another instance of this curious and unscientific method of ignoring the historical books of Moses, and of any theory of historical students adverse to that of the progress of the human race from barbarism to civilisation. In Sir Henry Maine's *Ancient Law* I find no reference* whatever to Moses as a lawgiver, except in the observation (at p. 197, sixth edition) that the Mosaic law provides nowhere for the privileges of testatorship. And, I observe, that if the author goes in his disquisitions further back than the Twelve Tables, he prefers to refer to Homer rather than to Moses. He also ignores everywhere the theory of the original civilisation of mankind. Man, created in the plenitude of his intellect and divinely taught, is an idea which seems always avoided by a school of writers who nevertheless make no overt profession of infidelity.

If we pass to another class of writers—the professed evolutionists—I think we shall agree that, whilst they build their theories on no sufficient basis of observed phenomena, they proclaim them with an arrogance which would rather invite pity and contempt than anger. When this handful of men attempt to set their baseless proclamations or edicts against the intuitions of mankind, and, *faute de mieux*, appeal to a pretended consensus of ‘modern thought,’ I am, for my part, rather amused than frightened

* Mr. Ryley has here, I think, overlooked a passage in Sir H. Maine's *Ancient Law*, p. 90, which I have quoted in *Tradition*, &c., p. 25. There can be no ground for the exclusion of the Bible testimony, except that *it* is an inspired narrative, or that it has not influenced the legislation of other nations. The latter is a point which Sir H. Maine must discuss with the Rev. H. Formby (*vide* his *Monotheism the Primitive Religion of Rome*).—A.

at their too pretentious magniloquence. Modern thought indeed! Why, their materialist theory is but the serving up of an old dish of the most evanescent school of the most discredited pagan cookery. So much for the qualification of their thought. It is certainly not modern in the sense of being new. As to its quantification, I wonder whether the inflated fancy of these gentlemen—and fancy is their strong point—can contrive to pretend to believe that the portion of educated thought amongst them can compare with that of the Fathers of the Vatican Council, fortified by the history of mankind and the consent and acceptance of Christendom. Surely if the appeal be to thought, whether ancient or modern, we must acknowledge ‘Deum rerum omnium principium et finem, naturali humanæ rationis lumine e rebus creatis certo cognosci, posse.* Or, in the words of the Nicene Creed, ‘Credo in unum Deum, Patrem omnipotentem, Factorem cœli et terræ, visibilium omnium et invisibilium.’ These documents will live and dominate thought when the ‘descent of man’ and the celebrated Belfast Address are forgotten, or preserved only as specimens of misapplied eloquence, evidencing the aberration of the human intellect, corrupted by pride, and enfeebled by the surrender of reason to fancy.

I take from Dr. Elam’s valuable opusculum, *Winds of Doctrine*,† a specimen, culled from Mr. Spencer’s *Principles of Biology*, of the inane arrogance and unreasoning—logic I was about to say, but I will call it predication of one who is credited with some authority as the philosophical exponent of the science of atheism. ‘To any one who says,’ writes Dr. Elam, ‘that he *thinks* the universe was created, Mr. Spencer replies, “No, you do not think so; for such a doctrine is not thinkable.” And to those who say they

* *Dei Filius*, cap. ii.

† p. 33.

believe in a Creator and a creation, Mr. Spencer replies, "No, you do not believe; you only believe you believe." Surely this is the very Dundermyism of philosophy.' I venture, in my turn, to ask whether arrogance and confusion of thought can go further. A Creator is unthinkable because impossible, and so unthinkable and unbelievable; but the belief being impossible, so surely is the belief in the belief. Really I cannot bring myself to be afraid of these revivers of exploded theories, which have never been able to hold their ground against the intuitions and common sense of mankind. Such imaginative speculations as natural selection, the survival of the fittest, and so of the progressive evolution of the human race, until such specimens of humanity as Adam, Noah, Moses, Solomon, Socrates, and Aristotle grow to the intellectual magnitude of Mr. Darwin, Mr. Spencer, and Mr. Clifford, require only to be broadly stated to be stripped of all their terrors, and relegated to the class of strange and temporarily destructive epidemics to which human reason, no less than the human body, is subject under maliferous conditions.

Science, guided and controlled by sound philosophy, is the true corrective of such aberrations of the human intellect.

In your first efforts to apply and compare the facts of tradition with the facts of the history of the human race, as recorded in the Sacred Scriptures, I perceived, not at once, but after much meditation, the elements of a true science, such as you propose as admissible to range with geology, philology, ethnology, or any other science whose facts are to be collected, weighed, and harmonised; and I looked on the science of tradition as an outwork covering the citadel, and greatly enlarging the area of the offensive range of the garrison charged with the defence of the

truths constituting a large part of the *depositum* committed to the custody of the Church. *Prosperere procede.*

I much wish that I had been able effectively to second your labours. As it is, I can only observe and recognise them.

Yours sincerely,

E. RYLEY.

THE
CHRISTIAN SCIENCE OF TRADITION,

In a Letter

FROM THE
REV. HENRY FORMBY,

AS A

SEQUEL TO THE CORRESPONDENCE

OF

LORD ARUNDELL OF WARDOUR AND MR. RYLEY.

PREFATORY NOTICE.

THE ensuing letter, which follows on, and which may be said to be connected with, those that have preceded it, in the way in which the capital is the fitting and natural termination of the column that has been raised, notwithstanding its own very slender claim to any great importance, will be found, equally with its companions, to belong to a very great and far-reaching subject, which is scarcely more, for the present, than beginning to challenge the study and attention that it cannot but be destined to command as time advances. This subject is the *relation of the world before Christ to His Mission and His Gospel*.

The Christ predicted by the prophet Isaias is One who is to become the '*Father of the (then) future world*' (Isaias ix. 6). But if, as Christians, we have now to believe that this prophecy has been fulfilled, every one must easily perceive how very greatly in the nature of things this belief may come to be confirmed and facilitated by our making progress in acquiring the knowledge of the manner and extent to which He has also been the '*Father of the past world*;' that is, at least of the world which sprang from the family saved in the Ark down to the date of the cradle of Bethlehem, not to insist upon that of the world before the Flood, of which the Book of Genesis is our sole informant. The Christ foretold by the prophet Micheas, again, is One 'whose going forth is from the beginning, from the days of eternity' (Micheas v. 2). The Christ of both these prophets is thus essentially 'a Christ of history,' and One to whom the annals of mankind are under a direct duty to bear their befitting testimony. He is announced by the one prophet as the *Father of the future Christian world*; and according to the words of the second prophet, 'His going forth is from the beginning;' the testimony, therefore, of the world before the Gospel is alike due to Him with that of the world subsequent to His coming.

The testimony of the world before the Gospel, however, it should be observed, stands upon a certain footing of comparative disadvantage, as regards those who are to benefit by it, contrasted with that of the world after Christ. The world after Christ is visible to the eye of the ordinary spectator; and the mere sight of the various countries of the earth, covered with their cathedrals, colleges, and other Christian foundations, is a living witness the burden of whose testimony speaks for itself. The testimony of the world before Christ, on the other hand, is practically almost a dead letter, except so far as the intelligence and industry of the Christian teachers succeed in gathering and collecting it, and in placing it before the minds of those who would otherwise be but very slightly aware of its existence. The literature of the Greeks and Romans, together with the traditions of the nations, may be most truly said to be surcharged with every variety of different testimony to Christ; but except for the patient labours of the Christian student, whose intervention is needed to search for them, to bring them to light, and to present them in an acceptable form, they may be as little known to those to whose faith they are capable of ministering the most profitable confirmation, as the diamonds of the South African diamond-fields have been unknown to the aborigines whom the white settlers have since displaced.

In this field of rich deposit of testimony to the truth of the Christian revelation, everything, as in the case of the diamond-fields and the gold-diggings, depends on the qualifications, the industry, and the sagacity with which the work of search is undertaken. And there would be no undue exaggeration in saying that the shepherd of the Roman Campagna, whom Virgil's Eclogue describes as commencing his musical contest with the lines,

‘A Jove principium Musæ, Jovis omnia plena
Ille colit terras, Illi mea carmina curæ,’

shows himself to be in possession, however dimly, but still in possession, of a truth of which the professor of subsequent times under the Christian religion, who conducts his class through their course of reading in the Greek and Latin classics, without point-

ing out to them a single Gentile testimony to the truth of the Christian revelation, gives much less satisfactory proof.*

The investigations pursued by Lord Arundell in the present pages, and continued from his previous volume, *Tradition, chiefly with Reference to Mythology, &c.*, will be found to carry on the same most important design, eminently appropriate at the present time as the natural and becoming barrier to the progress of

* I am not sure that, as Christians believing *ex animo* in the truth of the Christian redemption, we, at all times, properly bear in mind that Christ is foretold by the patriarch Jacob as 'the Expectation of the nations' (Gen. xlix. 10), and that His coming is predicted by the prophet Aggeus in the words, 'the *Desired of all nations* shall come' (Agg. ii. 8). The announcement of His being come is made by the angel to the Shepherds of Bethlehem in the words, 'I bring you glad tidings of a great joy, which shall be to *all people*.' One whom all nations look for and expect, who is the object of their earnest longing and desire, whose actual advent can bear to be announced to them as 'the glad tidings of a *great joy*,' cannot possibly be to them a mere stranger, or a great intangible void, or a dreamy mystification, for which the unbelief of men, as it has acquired its ill-starred maturity in the times after Christ, has invented the name 'Pantheism,' which the unbelief of the world before Christ was unequal to the task of coining. No; the nations are to hear the—to them perfectly intelligible—glad tidings that God has become a Man, and has been heard speaking with the lips of a Man upon earth, and they are to be filled with joy. Evidently, then, the knowledge of God has been spread through the nations as 'the waters cover the sea' (Isaías xi. 9, Hab. ii. 14.); or otherwise how could the nations have possibly rejoiced to hear the glad tidings that He, their God, had become a Man, of whose existence and being they are supposed to be entirely without knowledge? Had an evangelist come to the group of the three shepherds whom Virgil's Eclogue describes, after their contest was over, would he not have said to Dametas, 'I perceive that you have the knowledge of a "personal God," of whom the universe is full, who has a care for the estate of the earth, and who loves you and your songs. I have the glad tidings to bring you that this same God has been seen upon the earth, and that He has founded a visible Church, into which I invite you to enter'? Would the shepherd, whose companion afterwards sings, '*Aspice venturo lætantur ut omnia sæclo*,' be likely to turn away with the renegade derision and disdain of our nineteenth-century professors of a science of false name? The following passage from one of these professors, not quite so far advanced, however, in his evil course as some of his associates, may be here appropriately cited: 'We have in the Vedas the invocations *Dyaus pitar*, the Greek *Ζεὺς πάτερ*, the Latin *Jupiter*; and that means in all the three languages what it meant before these three languages were torn asunder—it means *Heaven, Father*' (Max Müller, *Lectures on the Science of Religion*, p. 172).

the current which is now setting in in the direction of blank atheism and total unbelief. Christ had said in His parable, 'They have Moses and the prophets; let them hear them;' and when the speaker pleaded with Abraham, 'Nay, father Abraham, but if one should go to them from the dead, they will do penance,' he received for answer, 'If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they believe though One rose from the dead' (Luke xvi. 29). Infidel science—or, as it would be much more fittingly called, renegade or apostate science—knows perfectly well that Christ is not separate from Moses; and it seeks to disencumber itself of Moses, knowing this to be the indispensable stepping-stone to its intended rejection of Christ. The reader will thus readily perceive that the investigations of the present volume, although they have for their avowed and direct aim the vindication of the truths of the Divine Revelation, as these are recorded in the first book of Moses, are none the less on this account the true Christian diamonds of the testimony of the world before Christ to His Gospel. If we are obliged at the present time to endure the grief of witnessing the daring and open manifestation of 'scientific' unbelief, we have also the corresponding consolation of seeing the learning of the world esteeming itself honoured by bringing to light the most varied confirmations of the unimpeachable truth of the Mosaic writings. The *Civiltà Cattolica* is able to write, 'The researches of learned men, with the whole of the results as yet obtained, do nothing else except bring into clearer relief the marvellous precision and accuracy of the text of the Bible. . . Genesis is the first book of the world, and Moses is the master of masters' (No. 688, February 15, 1879). Doubtless, as regards men, Moses is the master of masters; but St. Paul says to us, notwithstanding, 'Moses, indeed, was faithful in all His (Christ's) house as a servant, for a testimony to the things to be spoken; but Christ is as a Son in His own house' (Heb. iii. 5). To Him, then, whom the renegade and apostate men of a 'science of false name' intend to reject and dishonour, by the discredit they seek to throw on the records of Moses, be given all honour, praise, and glory, from every created being, both now and to the end of time.

HENRY FORMBY.

V.

MY DEAR FRIENDS,

I have read your correspondence with the very greatest interest, and rise up from its perusal with a kind of feeling which I have some difficulty in adequately describing. If, on the one hand, I may say, '*Repletus sum consolatione superabundo gaudio*,'—that a subject which so intimately concerns the welfare of the Catholic community of Great Britain, and the vigour of its life and action, has been taken up by those who are resolved to spare no pains to do their duty ably and efficiently towards it,—on the other hand, I experience misgivings which I cannot conceal. I cannot but feel deeply humiliated at the prospect which the immediate present furnishes of your efforts not at once meeting with the amount of appreciation that such labour rightly and justly claims from those whose cause is protected and strengthened by it in a manner which it must be either their very serious misfortune or their very great fault to fail adequately to comprehend. However, there is no reason on this account to give way to any feeling of despondency. The lesson which even ancient Rome teaches us is, that no condition of the commonwealth, however forlorn it may otherwise seem, can be such as to justify despair. When after the fourth victory of Hannibal, and the total annihilation of the last remaining army of the Republic, the surviving Consul returned to Rome with the shattered remnants of his forces, all Rome came out to meet him in order to offer their thanks to him that he had not despaired of the Republic. It may, then, be quite true for the present, that

very few, if any, amongst us adequately perceive the real value of the line of investigation which you are pursuing; but it by no means follows that this state of mind is destined to continue. '*Magna est veritas et prævalet,*' '*et obtinet in sæcula sæculorum*' (III. Esdras iv. 41). It may be a 'tradition,' handed down from the times when the Catholic faith was compelled to exist in Great Britain in the best way it could under a condition of 'penal servitude,' that its sole province was the heart of the individual, and its only place upon earth was the little obscure and hidden sanctuary, where its adherents could assemble, arriving thither by byways and concealed approaches. There is, however, no law in existence by which Catholic intelligence is bound to abstain from seeking traces of a tradition anterior to the date when the Catholic faith was, as I suppose we must say, through the sins and crimes of those who were then upon earth, by an act of the justice of the Sovereign Ruler of the World, placed in Great Britain in the condition of penal servitude, from which by His mercy it is now being permitted to emerge. It is said of the patriarch Joseph that the effect of his long maltreatment in prison was that 'the iron passed through his soul' ('*ferrum pertransiit animam ejus*'); but the effect upon Joseph was only for the time being—'*Donec veniret verbum ejus, eloquium Domini inflammavit eum*' (Ps. civ. 18). Nothing can permanently repress the Catholic faith, because no possible human barrier can be raised which the '*eloquium Domini*' will not burst in sunder. The barrier of the 'tradition' of our 'penal servitude' once fairly broken through, we can begin to ascend the stream of the past. Then it is we come in view of an Oxford and a Cambridge which were very different from what they are now. Everything, in a word, we find to be as different as possible from what it has since become. We can now breathe freely in the midst of the ages of faith; and though

human life was not by any means during those ages, any more than it is now, free from crimes and scandals, nevertheless civil rule and jurisprudence formally owned the supremacy of the faith of Christ; and as for the supremacy of the See of St. Peter no one dared openly to deny it, whoever may have sought the way and the means of contradicting. Ascending the stream higher still, we find barbarism being put to school to learn the arts of life, together with the light of faith, from the great Benedictine monasteries; and higher still we find heathen populations greeting each other with the glad tidings of great joy, that their long-cherished expectations have been fulfilled, and that the promised Divine Saviour has been seen and known among the Hebrew people, who have crucified Him for the redemption of man.

Ascending higher still and we come upon the period of time containing the traditions by means of which you propose to lay the foundations of your contemplated 'science of tradition.' For the purpose of adapting your labours to the exigencies of the time and the population, where they have to make their appearance on the arena of public discussion, you propose to gather together the elements by means of which future labour may succeed in constructing the 'science of tradition,' and you in the mean time set yourselves to prepare the way for the future construction of the science by a variety of tentative efforts and studies, all tending to indicate how such a science may be constructed, as also to throw light on the manner in which its future constructors should apply themselves to their task.

The end which I understand to be aimed at (for the present moment) by such a science is, to create common ground on which the defenders of a Divine Revelation will be able to meet the representatives of any science whose conclusions might appear to come into conflict with the

positive statements of the Bible. For the attainment of this end nothing but a science—or at least a scientific form of procedure, as you rightly contend—taking its recognised place among sciences can be of any avail. Sciences which profess to be founded on facts are properly to be met on their own ground of facts. If there is reason to think that the supposed science is merely the cloak of an attack upon the belief of mankind in the truths of a Divine Revelation, any suspicion to this effect, however well founded it may prove to be, does not alter the nature of things. The suspicion is one that very properly gives rise to a feeling of horror and detestation in every pious mind, but the pretended science remains to be dealt with on its own ground. In whatever way it may be important to meet it, it is to be met by a procedure as strictly scientific as its own. It appeals to facts and figures, and into the presence of facts and figures it must be brought, and with these it has to be confronted.

For whose benefit, however, it occurs here to ask the question, has the insidious science of the kind above described to be confronted with its natural and proper adversary, the counter science which you contemplate; and who are the persons who are to reap the chief benefit of the long and sustained labour which the construction of such a science must necessarily involve? If a city is attacked by an enemy, and the enemy is beaten off, all who are in the city as residents and proprietors owe a debt, as no one will dispute, to its defenders in proportion to the value of their stake in the safety of the city, and to the damage their persons, their families, and their possessions would have suffered had the enemy succeeded in making himself master. Those who happened to be either fast asleep at the time of the attack, or who were so absorbed in their own affairs as not to be aware of the great extent of the danger, perhaps hardly even conscious of the pre-

sence of danger at all, could scarcely be expected to be filled with any very great overflow of gratitude to those to whose prompt and effectual resistance to the enemy's attack they, nevertheless, owe their existing security. Before such as these can be expected to join heartily in the just gratitude of those who were really aware of the danger, it must obviously be necessary to take the requisite pains to make them fully acquainted with the true character and extent of the danger from which they have been preserved. Precisely the same rule also applies to the measures of precaution which are taken against a danger that is anticipated. Those only who clearly foresee the danger, and who distinctly comprehend the quarter from which it is likely to come, are in a condition to applaud the measures with which a wise and prudent forethought is determined to be beforehand, so as to bar as much as even its approach; and such as these only are likely to lend their coöperation, where this may be required, to procure for these precautionary measures their desired effect. A whole long-lived generation saw the patriarch Noah constructing his ship far away from the presence of any water, where it was the nature of such a construction to promise any profitable return for the capital and labour which must have been expended upon it. As much labour and cost would be required then as would have to be spent upon a similar construction in the present nineteenth century. And if those who were then spectators of Noah's work took, as may well be supposed to have been the case, but a very indifferent amount of interest in the survey of its gradual advance towards completion, the reason may be presumed to have been that they either entirely failed to understand what could be Noah's idea of the purpose for which he was causing it to be constructed, or, in the event of their having become acquainted with Noah's reasons, they must have thought him much too eccentric and visionary a kind

of man for them to trouble their heads either about him or the construction on which he was engaged.

If, then, the experience of the past is rather of such a kind as to lead to the anticipation that for the present those who have really the most to gain for their cause, from the successful construction of the scientific form of procedure which you are contemplating, will not be among the foremost of those who will rejoice over the progress which it is making, this circumstance we may charitably presume must arise from causes which are quite within the reach of their appropriate remedy.

Want of zeal in behalf of their cause is not for a moment to be admitted. The honour of the Catholic faith must be far too near to the heart of all who hold this faith to admit the thought of such a motive as this. The explanation consequently of the imperfect interest which may have been hitherto observable, as regards the progress of the work you have undertaken, is much rather to be sought for in other causes. One of these causes may be, and very probably really is, a certain defective perception (which it is to be hoped admits of being removed) of the reality of the injury with which the Catholic faith is threatened from the alleged sciences to which you purpose to oppose your contemplated mode of defence. A concurrent cause may also be sought for in the not entirely unreasonable diffidence, with reference to the ultimate triumph of the work, of those who only represent themselves for the present as engaged on breaking new ground, with a view to the final establishment of their impregnable position.

Here, then, it must be obvious that the first step in the direction of the desired remedy is to be sought for, in laying before those who believe, and who desire to retain and preserve their belief, in the Divine Revelation made by God to man (and in this class the foremost place belongs

of right to the children of the Catholic Church), the proofs that are proper to awaken their attention to the immediate presence of positive danger. It has, for example, to be made distinctly intelligible that the evolution theory of Darwin, the indefinite length of the existence of man upon the earth, pushed back by an unlimited retrogression into the remote past, and the theory or theories of Mr. Max Müller on the origin of religion, are directly subversive of the possibility of belief in the actual Divine Revelation which has been given to us. No doubt other similar perverse efforts, fraught with the same evil consequences, might be here enumerated; but the above will suffice for our present purpose.

Mr. Darwin, for example, cannot convince me of the truth of his scientific inference from the facts to which he appeals, namely, that man, such as he is now bred and born, lives and dies, is an evolution from the ape, finally produced, after an indefinite duration of time, by the process of a continuous reception and transmission of organic life imperceptibly improving in each successive step, without taking away from me and destroying my belief in that portion of the Divine Revelation which informs me that God created Adam a perfect man, and formed Eve out of a rib taken from Adam's side.

The theory of an indefinite duration in the past of the human race cannot claim my assent without destroying my belief in the truth of St. Matthew's and St. Luke's genealogy of Christ. The reason is that, however removed these genealogies may be from insisting upon one absolute and irremovably fixed sum of years as the condition of their being received, it is equally clear that they inexorably insist upon such a fixed term of years as is compatible with their possibility, according to the conditions of human life that are known to us, and that they consequently exclude the possibility of the claim to an indefi-

nite duration in the past of the human race. Christ Himself says that 'the things concerning Me have an end' (Luke xxii. 37). But that, in the world of man, which has an end has also a beginning; and if a revelation from God is before me, which fixes this beginning within such and such defined limits of time in the past, it must be obvious to every one that if I consent to place this beginning altogether outside the possibility of these limits, I must cease to be any longer a believer in this revelation.

And lastly, in the same manner as regards Mr. Max Müller's philosophy on the origin of religion. We are by no means to overlook the existence of a particular side in this philosophy which admits of a certain limited coincidence with the belief in a Divine Revelation. Tertulian speaks of the human soul as 'naturally Christian;' and the belief in a Divine Revelation requires nothing whatever that savours of disparagement of the powers with which the Divine Creator has endowed the soul of raising herself above the visible world to an imperfect knowledge of God and His attributes—powers which could lead such a perfect man of the world as Horace to call her '*divinæ particulam auræ*' (ii. Sat. ii. 79).

But when we come to a theory which professes to account for all the various external phenomena of religion, such as altars, temples, sacrifices, liturgies, ceremonies, rites of initiation in mysteries, and the like, independently of any instruction which man has received from God, and which finds the sole exclusive source of them in the human soul itself, here is a philosophy which is simply incompatible with belief in the Divine Revelation which the Catholic Church teaches and which I am bound and firmly resolved to believe.

Belief in a Divine Revelation attributes to God the office of the Instructor of man in his duties and observances of religion. In Paradise, Adam and Eve were

taught the religious duty of the Sabbath or seventh day ; and on their expulsion from Paradise, the worship of sacrifice and the ceremonies and ritual of the altar service. The same instruction was continued in the ark of Noah. To the ark succeeded the call of Abraham and the covenant of circumcision with Abraham's descendants, from whom prophets and teachers were raised up, whose ministry was by no means confined to the narrow limits of their own nation ; and this *ad interim* state of provision for the divine work of teaching mankind continued till the coming of God Himself in a human nature, with the mission to perfect and complete the provision for teaching mankind, by the institution and the sending forth of His Church. Disguise the truth in every possible way that ingenuity can suggest, and the fact will still remain the fact—that if I assent to Mr. Darwin's theory of the evolution of man from the ape, or to the infinite duration of the human race in the past, or to Mr. Max Müller's philosophy of the origin of religion exclusively from the human soul, I make shipwreck of my belief in a Divine Revelation, or, in other words, I cease to be a Christian. When Noemi came back to the land of Israel with her two daughters-in-law, from her sojourn in the territory of Moab during the scarcity in the land of Israel, one of her daughters-in-law left her to go back to her family in Moab, the other, Ruth, made her choice to accompany her mother-in-law. If I, with a full knowledge of what I am doing, give in my deliberate adhesion to any one of the three *soi-disantes* sciences above mentioned, I renounce my adhesion to the Divine Revelation, and, like Noemi's daughter-in-law, I make a deliberate act of choice to go back to the land of Moab.

Possibly it may not cost persons like ourselves any very serious effort to value the three particular theories of the above-named scientists at their worth. It may be

even possible for us to look upon them as little better than the sort of obstructions that are occasionally to be found in the high-road, from which the ordinary wayfarer who is alive to his own safety very rationally turns aside, without, however, as it may be proper to observe, thereby implying any general attitude whatsoever of disrespect to the really practised skill which able and industrious observers frequently display, or to the conclusions which they draw from what, after all, is but their limited array of facts. Those who feel that they have a firm standing on a ground secured by a Divine Revelation from the Creator to the creature may smile at the audacity of the large and confident conclusions of those who arrogate to themselves the right to be the representatives of modern thought. Still we can hardly shut our eyes to the fact that there is a sort of scientific craze in the air. Science has come to be foolishly looked upon as a sort of temple for the human mind.

The original temptation of man is cropping up again. 'Ye shall be as gods,' scientes, 'full of knowledge.' The leaders of science may delude poor mortals in the nineteenth century, as the demigods led astray the old deluded Gentile world. A poor soft young Catholic, particularly if just emerging from incomplete studies, unripe and immature, and entering the world inexperienced, may feel himself rather overawed by the name of such a supposed leader of science as Mr. Max Müller, and may turn a little pale at the thought of having to stand the brunt of daring to express his contempt for the philosophy of so great a man, or rather arch-flamen of the Temple of Science. He may think himself—and who can say that he would not herein give proof of his good sense and prudence?—to be '*impar congressus Achilli*.'

Yet we have to be aware of the fact that the three *soi-disantes* sciences above enumerated have, in one shape or

another, permeated the world, into which our Catholic youth have to enter to take their place in it. At one time or another, consequently, these sciences or philosophies or theories, call them what you choose, will be sure to present themselves before those who have been taught to believe in the truth of a Divine Revelation, and will then challenge their assent on the grounds of science.

In proportion, then, to the actual amount of fame and reputation which these said 'theories,' 'sciences,' or whatever else may be the designation by which they are to be popularly known, are commonly understood to enjoy, as belonging to the category of things generally believed to deserve to be held in universal high repute, such will be, when they come to challenge the assent of our inexperienced youth, the sum of tempting force with which they will come before the half-formed unripe minds who are just entering into their place in the world. Considering the sad failure of the effort lately made to establish a college of common resort, devoted to the pursuit of higher studies, and the consequent continuance of the necessity for trusting our Catholic youth to take their place in the world totally shorn of all participation in a more mature course of such studies as those which form the men who rule the destinies of the British Empire, we cannot afford to let it remain a matter of indifference that the seductive power of these *soi-disantes* sciences, or, as St. Paul would call them, these 'oppositions of falsely-named sciences' ('*oppositiones falsi nominis scientiæ*,' 1 Tim. vi. 20), should continue unchallenged. They must no longer exercise unopposed their noxious influence over the insufficiently guarded and the imperfectly protected minds of our inexperienced youth. Considering the circumstances and the needs of our times, it appears to become a clear duty of religion to take mea-

tures to have these seductive influences previously beaten down to their possible minimum.

This is the aim which you place before yourselves in your contemplated construction of a 'science of tradition.' I understand that you propose to take up such a kind of position as the following, against the framers of 'the oppositions of the various falsely-named sciences' above enumerated, as also against all others of a like kind who may hereafter arise. You would say to them, 'Gentlemen, are you aware of the existence of a vast body of human testimony floating about in the tradition of the various people of the earth, which you must take into your account in the framing of your theories?' I suppose these gentlemen to reply to you, 'We are, no doubt, in a general way, aware of the existence of that to which you refer; but we have not taken any account of it as yet, for the best of reasons, because it exists in such a scattered, fragmentary, inconsistent, self-contradictory, and unmeaning form, that nothing worthy of the attention of any scientific man can be found in it.' To this I presume you would reply, 'Gentlemen, this subterfuge shall not be permitted to serve your purpose; because, although it may be quite true that the general aspect of the tradition of the nations of the earth presents a scene of wild disorder, or, if you like to say it, you may be welcome, "chaotic confusion," it is by no means true that a careful and judicious inquiry into this tradition, conducted upon principles akin to those which jurists are accustomed to apply to the sifting and examination of the testimony with which they are concerned, will not elicit facts from it which must challenge your attention, and with which you must deal, or otherwise renounce your pretensions to be concerned with science.

'For example, you, Mr. Darwin, who think yourself quite entitled to assume it as certain that Adam and Eve

never had any existence, what have you got to say in explanation of the fact that a clear traditional memory is traceable among a number of different people now speaking different languages and inhabiting distant portions of the earth, in such a manner as to necessitate the conviction that while for generations they have lived asunder without any communication with each other, there must have been a time when their ancestors were in communication with each other, and when their traditional memory was common to them all? But this common traditional memory perfectly coincides with the Mosaic account of the creation of Adam, and the subsequent formation of Eve out of a rib taken from his side. How do you explain the existence of this memory, perpetuated from generation to generation by oral tradition found in so many different parts of the earth among the indigenous inhabitants, consistently with your theory? Suppose Mr. Darwin to reply, 'Before I can consent to give any answer, allow me to say that I cannot be satisfied with any ordinary statement that the case is as you represent it to be. I must challenge your evidence.' Who does not perceive here that the question which is now introduced turns upon the value of the evidence for proving the existence of this alleged tradition in different parts of the earth, after which will come the subsequent question as to its substantial identity with the account in the Book of Genesis? It is thus at once plain to every practical mind that the labour of collecting the evidence in question, and indeed all such evidence of the same kind, considering the number of recondite sources from which it has to be laboriously picked out, must be directed by a science which is at least the cousin-german, if it is not the twin-brother, of the judicial science of dealing with the evidence necessary for the conduct of ordinary procedures in cases of civil, and even criminal, jurisprudence. The circle of readers forms the quasi-jury, the

promoter of the suit is the advocate of the truth of the Divine Revelation, and the defendant is the pretentious science of a false name which is impugned, and which is represented in the court either by its founder or by one of its leading advocates.

Supposing the case to be so far advanced that the evidence adduced by the promoter of the suit is allowed to stand good, and the court rules that the attempt to challenge it has broken down and cannot be sustained, and that the traditional memory is found to be everywhere uniform, as also to agree with the account of Moses, the issue which follows then is plain and clear. Mr. Darwin is now called upon to account for the existence of this widespread traditional memory of so many distinct populations, agreeing with each other and with the Mosaic testimony, consistently with his theory of the existence of man upon earth as the product of evolution from an ancestry of apes, who again are only intermediaries between us and a lower form of organic matter. This he must proceed to do; and should he either refuse to make the attempt, or should he make the attempt and be judged notably to fail of success, the penalty then must unavoidably be incurred by him. The jackdaw, however reluctant he may be, must submit to be stripped of the jay's feathers, with which he has decked himself out for the purpose of causing it to be popularly believed that he occupied a very exalted seat in the Temple of Science.

Thus the application of a quasi-judicial scientific skill and experience to the task of gathering together the particular, telling, and appropriate evidence which the vast body of the tradition of the nations and people of the earth is able to place at the call of the expert who undertakes the task, is seen, in the sample instance above sketched, to yield an amount of appreciable service to the cause of the Catholic faith about the value of which there ought to be

no possible room for a second opinion. St. Paul writes 'that there are many vain talkers and seducers, whose mouths must be stopped' ('quos oportet redargui'), 'who subvert whole houses' (Titus i. 10). To silence and put to shame the inventors and defenders of these 'oppositions of a science of false name,' at least before those who are exposed to the danger of being deceived and led away by them—that is to say, before our inexperienced Catholic youths, to whom perhaps are also to be added not a few of their seniors, whose experience in such questions is scarcely to be measured by their years—is obviously to render an extremely appreciable service. If to this it has to be further considered that the task of bringing these 'vain talkers' into the presence of a tribunal competent to call them to give an account of themselves is one that cannot be so much as approached without long and patient previous study, and cannot possibly promise itself even any very tangible result, except through the application of a really scientific skill to the preparation of the evidence, which is not to be acquired otherwise than in the arena of actual service and conflict,—it becomes plain that whoever can achieve any success in this labour earns an extremely solid title to the gratitude of his fellow-believers in the truth of a Divine Revelation.

It may, however, be well before indulging in too sanguine hopes of a success to be achieved to take cognisance of a certain feature in the practical aspect of affairs, as regards the persons of the demigods themselves, who sit on their lofty seats in the Temple of Infidel Science, whence they palm off upon the crowd of their adoring worshippers the 'oppositions of a science of false name,' for which you propose to call them to an account.

'I can call spirits from the vasty deep,' says Glendower.

'Ay, but,' rejoins Percy of Northumberland, 'will they come when you do call?'

Are these demigods of the Temple of Infidel Science likely to surrender to any summons which it is in your power to serve upon them, or to consent to appear before any court from which a question concerning the truth of our Divine Revelation could obtain a really judicial hearing? Do they not look upon themselves as occupying the

‘Sapientum templa serena
Despicere unde queas alios’?

Do they not reckon upon the multitude as their captives and their blind adorers? And have they not sufficient grounds for considering themselves entirely outside the reach of any kind of reasoning which you can place before them? Will not one demigod of this Temple of Infidel Science telegraph to his brother-demigod, ‘Here is a believer in this “Hebrew Child,” who wants to interfere with our supremacy in our Temple of Science. Let us take no notice of him. The world is with us, and not with him! If he tries to find a place amongst us, we know how to deal with him. We have no concern with his Hebrew Child; and we understand how to keep our Temple of Science for ourselves, and to close its doors against all uninitiated intruders’? What resource can you have here but to pursue your own useful career of labour, and leave the result in the hands of the God whose revelation these short-lived demigods of the Temple of Infidel Science think themselves quite secure in their design of persisting to ignore?

However, if the final overthrow of the Temple of Infidel Science is still an event, the accomplishment of which is far off, it by no means follows that the service to be rendered to the cause of faith in the mean time is on this account in any sense in abeyance. The message of God to His prophet moreover does not merely give him a commission, ‘ut evellas’ (‘that thou mayest root up’); it also enjoins upon him, ‘ut et ædifices et plantes’ (‘that thou

mayest plant and build,' Jer. i. 10). It may quite possibly, and indeed even quite probably, turn out that the labour spent upon the task of trying to induce the demigods of the Temple of Infidel Science to descend from their seats in their temple, and consent to plead on behalf of their so-called sciences before a jury of their countrymen, will, as far as the demigods themselves are concerned, be simply labour in vain. But because it is labour in vain as regards those who, having already deified themselves, are now wholly beyond the reach of benefit, it by no means follows that it will be in vain as regards others. When those who have deified themselves, and are followed by the crowd of their blind worshippers, are dismissed from consideration, there still remains a vast multitude who are not without their hunger and thirst for a body or vein of knowledge which can at once satisfy their cravings for information, and also, at the same time, confirm their faith in the doctrines and tenets to which they deliberately desire to remain for ever firmly attached. If your labours in analysing and reducing to system the rich and valuable testimony to the truths of Divine Revelation, which the great '*rudis indigestaque moles*' of the tradition of the nations of the earth contains, are little likely to cause many of the self-complacent scientists of the current hour to stop in mid-career, and submit to the ordeal of being put through an interrogatory, in order to be compelled to plead in defence of their so-called sciences,—they may still find a warm response from those who both believe and desire to meet with knowledge which will enable them to believe better, and more resolutely and firmly than ever. The testimony of tradition to the truths of revelation, which can prove nothing but gall and wormwood to the demigods of the Temple of Infidel Science, may be made, with the necessary care and study, sweet as honey to the children of the Church.

The subject which here opens itself to view is an extremely wide one, and I must remember that I am approaching very near the proper limits of the interlocutory share which I have been invited to take in this correspondence, and forbear in the outset from introducing new matter into it in any such manner as to find myself unable to withdraw from it without pursuing it to much greater length than my title to take part in the correspondence would warrant, or to which the occasion would properly lend itself.

Nevertheless it is one of the great and exclusive privileges of being a Roman Catholic to find oneself at home in all the nations, and among all the people, of the entire earth. And the great advantage that is to be derived from being thus at home everywhere is that where the learning and erudition that is needed for the service of the cause of faith is defective in any one branch of study in the language of the particular nation to which we may belong, as Roman Catholics we have the privilege of ranging over all the languages of the earth, and of finding in these languages the work of our brethren in a common faith ready made to our needs, to supply the defectiveness of which we may have had reason to become aware in our own.

I find in the language of Germany two works by a pair of Roman Catholic writers who have each made the great body of the tradition of the nations the subject of almost a life-long study, with the same general aim in view as yourselves, to extract from it confirmation of the truths of Divine Revelation. The first of these is Ernst von Lasaulx, and the second is Dr. Johann Sepp. The former was born in the year 1805, and is now some years deceased; the second was born in 1818, and still holds a post as professor in the University of Munich. Both were travellers, and resided for some time in Palestine, and both were chosen to represent Bavaria in the Diet of Frankfort which sat during the years 1848 and 1849.

Lasaulx is chiefly known as a classical scholar and student of the literature of ancient Greece and Rome; Dr. Sepp is celebrated as the author of a Life of Christ in six volumes, which is written on purpose to oppose the Life of Christ by Dr. Strauss. In order, however, the more effectually to counteract the poison contained in the work of Strauss (Strauss throughout insinuates that the Christ of the four Evangelists is nothing more than the ideal person of a mythical fiction), Sepp wrote a work in three volumes as an introduction, or, perhaps, more truly, as a pioneer, of the way for his Life of Christ, under the title, *Heathendom, and its Significance for Christendom*. Sepp's Life of Christ has found a French translator, who, however, has produced much more of an abridgment than a translation; but, as far as I am aware, neither the treatises of Lasaulx nor the *Heathendom*, &c., of Sepp has as yet been translated into any other language.

Lasaulx lived in Munich, attached to its University as Professor of Philosophy, and what chiefly remains of his numerous writings is a collection in one volume, quarto (Manz, Regensburg, 1854), of the various dissertations which he read before the Academy of Sciences in Munich. These treatises, as a whole, lack the professed systematic purpose of Dr. Sepp's three volumes, *Heathendom*, &c.; yet nothing can surpass their value in the way of a storehouse of varied information elucidating the intimate connection subsisting between the religion of the Gentile world and Christian truth. Lasaulx was, in consequence, a most uncompromising defender of the use of the chief works of classic literature, Latin and Greek, in schools and colleges.

Monsignor (at that time simply Abbé) Gaume, upwards of twenty years ago, as we may remember, headed a crusade in France which aimed at banishing the Greek and Roman classic authors from use in schools and colleges, and at

substituting for them works of various Christian Latin and Greek authors. The contention of the learned abbé and his friends was, that the writings which they wished to have removed breathed a spirit that was extremely opposite to that of Christianity, and that the existing decay of faith and religion was mainly to be accounted for by the constant substitution of the standard of thought of the Gentile world in the place of the Christian standard. The learned abbé, however, and his adherents failed to perceive that if there was a 'Charybdis' to be avoided, it was also necessary to take equal care not to fall into a 'Scylla.' The desire to arrive at a form of Christianity entirely expurgated from what they contemptuously spoke of as the contaminations of Paganism carried with it the unforeseen effect of producing a Christianity which could not claim any reasonable man's belief. For the Christian religion, which Christ Himself brought into the world, is by no means an entirely new building, but an edifice built upon old preëxisting foundations, laid by those whom He had sent into the world before Him. It is thus obvious that it must be quite in vain to preach to a cavilling and sceptical world the doctrine that God unexpectedly awoke out of a long trance of neglect to take men by a sudden surprise in a manifestation of His love and care for them for which nothing previous had prepared them. The Abbé Gaume failed to perceive that such as this is the incredible Christianity which results from the determination to put asunder what God has joined together, namely, the world before and the world after Christ.

The leading thought, then, that runs through all Lasaulx's various disquisitions is that the world before Christ was under a continual discipline and care on the part of God, preserving among the various nations the remnants of their original Revelation derived from the Ark of their great patriarch and ancestor, the priest and prophet,

Noah, and preparing them for the future coming of Christ and His religion in their midst. Hence Lasaulx contends that the traditions of the nations—more especially as these are enshrined in the various works of the Greek and Latin literature which have come down to us—bear abundant testimony to this action on the part of God.

To quote a spécimen of the author's line of thought. In his treatise upon the legend of 'Prometheus,' and its hidden meaning, after having spoken of the Gentile mythology as a vast enigma which first begins to become intelligible in the Person of Christ, Lasaulx goes on to say :

'Considered under this point of view, profane history, like that of the Israelite people, becomes figurative of Christianity; and it would be possible to form out of this history, in conjunction with the religions of the Gentile world, a second apocryphal Old Testament, the continuation and completion of both of which is contained in the New Testament. In the same manner as the whole of the world before Christ was one entire scene of preparation for His coming, in Judaism this coming was clearly predicted beforehand, and in the Gentile world it was instinctively foreseen and hoped for; or, to express the same thought in a more definite manner, it appertains to the Christian philosophy of history to show in what way the "Desired of all the nations" has His particular manifestations of Himself in the Gentile world, equally with the Jewish people. An example to this effect will be given in the exposition of the Prometheus legend upon which I now enter (*Prometheus, die Sage und ihr Sinn*).'

The following passage also may serve in like manner as a key to the author's current of thought :

'But inasmuch as all history is in the last instance a history of religion, so Christianity, as the universal religion of the entire world, has taken up into itself every popular religion in so far as these have contained elements of truth. There is scarcely a single truth clearly enunciated in the Christian religion which has not been found, at least in substance, in the world before Christ. This truth shall be made to appear in the following pages, in which we shall have to treat of "Expiatory Sacrifice" as the centre of all positive religion.'—*Die Suhnopfer der Griechen und ihr Verhältniss zu dem*

einem auf Golgotha,—‘The Expiatory Sacrifices of the Greeks, and their Relation to the Sacrifice upon Golgotha,’ p. 1.

I am warned that my limits are about to be exceeded. I should have much liked to have attempted to give an idea of the contents of the three volumes of Dr. Sepp; but these are so various, and treat of such a wide extent of detail, that space absolutely forbids even the thought of making the attempt. I may, however, cite the concluding paragraph of his work, which shows how a precisely similar vein of thought to that of Lasaulx presents itself to his mind as the sum of his long and minute examination of the vast body of the Gentile tradition :

‘Thus the Jews set themselves up,’ observes Dr. Sepp, ‘against the Gentiles, full of self-complacency on account of their unquestioned election; St. Paul, in consequence, addresses himself to them in the following strain (Rom. ii. 17), “If thou gloriest in the name of Jew, and retest thyself in the law, and makest thy boast in God; if thou knowest His will and approvest the more profitable things, being instructed in the law, and art confident that thou art a leader of the blind, and the light of those that are in darkness, a teacher of the unwise, and the instructor of infants, having the form of knowledge and of truth in the law—thou that teachest another, dost thou not teach thyself? Thou that abhorrest idols, dost thou rob God of His own? How canst thou make thy boast in the law when thou dishonourest God by breaking the law? Through you Jews the name of God is blasphemed among the heathen.” Whilst the adherents of the law of Moses held that it was only through the covenant of circumcision and a participation in their ceremonial law that any Gentile could be saved, Christ calls Zachæus to come down from the fig-tree into which he had climbed, that he might at least let his eyes rest on the person of Christ; and soon afterwards Christ withers up by His curse a similar fig-tree which He found covered with leaves, but bearing no fruit, thereby intending it to become the figure of the people, once chosen, but henceforward ripe for rejection. As then salvation came to the house of Zachæus, and as he, the heathen tax-gatherer, was straightway pronounced to be a son of Abraham without its being necessary for him to remain on the tree of the law into which he had climbed, so the Redeemer turns Himself chiefly to the heathen people. The Mosaic law will shortly be declared abrogated by the council of the Apostles in Jerusalem (Acts xv.);

and in the direct reception of the Greeks into the Church, the heathen world appears as at least an indirect SCHOOL OF PREPARATION FOR THE GOSPEL.'

I hope then, in conclusion, that if I have failed in giving an adequate treatment to so great and so absorbing a topic, I have at least not been wanting in manifesting my sense of the scarcely to be over-appreciated value of the labour upon which you are engaged. I think that the more this vein of study and investigation is pursued the more clearly we shall find that its neglect, which is chargeable to our predecessors, plays a far larger part than we have at present any just conception of in the frightful growth of the infidel spirit which is characteristic of our nineteenth century. The human mind can only be drawn towards a uniform conception of God as never for a single moment having ceased to watch over the whole of His creation, the Gentile world equally with the people of His special covenant. When, therefore, the testimony of the tradition of the people of the earth is made to yield its clear and convincing proof that, from the days of Adam downwards, God has never for a moment ceased to show Himself the 'Great Father' in heaven of all people; that His care is equally for the little and the great (Wisd. vi. 8); that all the religions of the world contain at least some remnants of the divine truth of which the Ark of Noah was the primary storehouse for the world born from his family; that the Christian religion is sent into the world on the mission to rehabilitate all these truths, as also at the same time to correct all the errors and perversions with which they have been associated, and to restore to the earth one sacrifice and one altar,—one of the chief sources of temptation to fall into the heartless scepticism of our particular times,* will be greatly diminished if it is

* I cannot forbear, on the subject of 'the heartless scepticism that distinguishes the present time,' to cite the following testimony, in corroboration of the truth I am contending for in the text, namely, that what-

not entirely closed. 'Many prophets and kings desired to see the things which you see, and have not seen them; and to hear the things which you hear, and have not heard them' (Luke x. 24), are the words of Christ. The religious traditions of the nations may thus become the best of all schools to the Christian. We not only perceive in them a singular proof of the tenacity of divine truth, and how the 'truth of the Lord stands fast for ever;' but when we come to see the reverence and the religious veneration with which the Gentile worshipper was accustomed to set himself about the task of his divine worship, we may very profitably enter into ourselves, and come before our own hearts with the question, What would not this Gentile have done had he seen the things which we see, and heard the things which we hear?

Believe me to remain

Ever yours very sincerely,

HENRY FORMBY.

ever tends to narrow the Christian religion and to exhibit it as anything less than what it really is, the Word of God to man, spoken by the mouth of God Himself for all people and all times, in confirmation and fulfilment of everything previously spoken by the prophets of God, tends to produce the heartless scepticism complained of. The passage occurs in the volume, *The Religions of the World in their Relation to Christianity*, by F. D. Maurice, M.A., fifth edition:

'A faith which boasts to be for humanity cannot test its strength unless it is content to deal with men in all possible conditions. If it limits itself to England, it will adapt and fashion itself to the habits and fashions of England, and of England too in a particular age. But doing this, you will never reach the hearts of Englishmen. You say, Try your Christianity upon the cotton-spinners of Manchester, upon the hardware men of Birmingham; if it fail with them, do you expect it will succeed in Persia and Thibet? We know it *will fail*, it *must fail*, in Birmingham and Manchester, if it addresses the people in those places mainly as spinners and workers in hardware. . . . Therefore it becomes more evident every day that there is a demand in Manchester and Birmingham for that which we cannot supply till we understand human beings better. To acquire that understanding, we need not grudge a journey to Persia or Thibet' (p. 249). It would be a sentiment akin to the above to say, 'Study the traditions of the world before Christ if you wish adequately to understand how His religion is adapted to the various people to whom He has come as both their Redeemer and their Teacher.'

APPENDICES

TO

LORD ARUNDELL OF WARDOUR'S LETTER III.

APPENDIX A (p. 42).

ON A CERTAIN MODE OF CRITICISM: a reply to the *Dublin Review*,
Oct. 1872; also in reply to *Dublin Review*, Jan. 1879.

THERE is a certain mode of criticism which will be always found to be very effective when the intention is to be at once trenchant and friendly. It takes the ground from under the feet in so gentle a manner that no one would seem to have the right to complain. It consists in objecting to the line of argument taken, that it would not apply in certain future and different conditions and contingencies, with the inference that it is not applicable *hic et nunc*.

This mode of criticism is much in vogue in current Catholic literature, and is fostered by the over-anxiety manifested in the Catholic press that no arguments put put forward should be such as would prejudice the cause. This anxiety, of course, is most salutary and laudable; but it may go to the extent of paralysing and neutralising the effect of every argument advanced on the side of religion, and appears to me to presuppose a theory and standard of optimism which is ordinarily unattainable. It may well be that outside the domain of faith it is not given, and may never be given, to the defenders of truth, so entirely to extirpate error by their arguments that no germs or vestiges of it should remain. Error, like poverty, will be always with us; and it may, perhaps, also be written that sufficient for the day is the argument thereof; and if the refutation (being of course truthful) suffices to silence the objections that are there and then

advanced, nothing more *de rigueur* would be required for the protection of faith, which, judging from the experience of the past, would seem to have been the end of discussion, and the measure of the light vouchsafed, rather than the eliciting or manifestation of recondite facts and knowledge. 'Tradidit mundum disputationi eorum' (Eccles. iii. 11).

Now I will venture to apply these remarks to a very able, and in intention very friendly, review of my book on *Tradition*, in the *Dublin Review*, Oct. 1872, more particularly with reference to the criticism of the following passage :

'Although the testimony of history is definite and decisive as to the chronology of the world, within the limits of a few hundred years, there is a general assumption, in all branches of scientific inquiry, that man must have existed many thousand years beyond the period thus assigned to him. Lyell speaks of "the vastness of time"* required for his development; and Bunsen, as we have seen, requires twenty thousand years, at least, between the Deluge and the nativity of our Lord: and wherefore this discrepancy? Because of a fundamental assumption—not merely hypothetical for the convenience of inquiry—but confident and absolute; an assumption which, so far as the argument is concerned, is the very matter in dispute—that man must have progressed and developed to the point at which we see him.

'At the same time, the actual chronology cannot be altogether ignored, and some cognisance must be taken of the facts which history presents to us; and it is this unfortunate exigency, interrupting the placid course of development, which not frequently lands scientific inquirers of the first eminence in difficulties from which it will take an indefinite lapse of time to extricate them;

* *Principles of Geology*, tenth edition, 1868, ii. p. 471.

ex. gra. Bunsen, in his *Egypt* (iii. 379), says : “ It has been more than once remarked, in the course of this work, that the *connection between the Chinese and the Egyptians* belongs, in several of its phases, to the *general history* of the world. The Chinese language is the furthest point beyond that of the formation of the Egyptian language, which represents, as compared with it, the middle ages of mankind—viz. the Turanian and Chamitic stages of development.”

‘ The conclusion of philology (*vide* also Brace’s *Ethnology*, p. 114) is, therefore, that the Turanian or Chamitic grew out of the more inorganic and elementary Chinese.

‘ Now let us compare Lyell’s conclusions with Bunsen’s. Lyell equally believes (*Principles of Geology*, ii. 471) “ that three or four thousand years is but a *minute fraction* of the time required to bring about such wide divergence from a common parent stock, ‘ as between’ the Negroes and Greeks and Jews, Mongols and Hindoos, represented on the Egyptian monuments.”

‘ At the same time he indorses Sir John Lubbock’s view, and pronounces, upon what appears to me very light and insufficient grounds (ii. 479), that “ the theory, therefore, that the savage races have been degraded from a previous state of civilisation *may be rejected* :” and by implication that the civilised races have progressed from the savage state may be affirmed.

‘ I have, then, only to assume one point, that Sir C. Lyell will concede the order of progress or development to have been from black to white, and that he will pay us the compliment of being the more favoured race.

‘ But of all the races that are akin to the Mongol or Turanian, the Chinese are the whitest, and most nearly approach the European in colour.

‘ How many years, then, may we suppose that it took the Chinese to progress from the black state of the

Egyptian? As many, let us conjecture, as it took the Egyptian to progress linguistically from the state of the Chinese or Mongol! This is one instance of entanglement in which the theory of progress, pure and simple, from a parent stock, will involve us' (vide *Tradition, &c.*, p. 72-74).

In the first place the reviewer says, 'the author starts with a special reply addressed to Sir C. Lyell;' which the author does not, although he starts with a special appeal to Sir C. Lyell and to Baron Bunsen to reconcile the discrepancies in the arguments by which they arrive at the common conclusion that a vast lapse of time is required to account for man's development to his present condition. The reviewer then, and not unfairly, proceeds to summarise my argument thus (p. 486):

'If the negro type was the original, it took' [*i.e.* according to Baron Bunsen's philological argument] 'myriads of years to introduce the Caucasian' [no, not the Caucasian, but the lighter-coloured Chinese]; 'if the Caucasian was the first, it took' [according to Lyell's ethnological argument] 'myriads of years to introduce the negro.' This is how the reviewer meets it: 'Sir C. Lyell would probably reply to it that Egyptians and Chinese, as it were, started equally black, and equally rude in language. The Egyptian progressed in language, but did not (because he stopped at home) progress in colour. The Chinese did not progress, at least very notably, in language, but (because he changed climates, &c.) he progressed a good deal in colour. If there is any entanglement here, it is, we think, one of Lord Arundell's own making.'

Now it seems to me sufficient to plead that the Catholic apologist is not called upon to do more than deal with the argument in hand; and I contend that, to the scientific postulate of progress and the indefinite lapse of time, my apposition of Bunsen's position to Lyell's, both being

based on the postulate, is an adequate and legitimate reply, more particularly at a time when scientific men have taken to haranguing us, and are disposed to legislate for our ignorance in the name of science.*

If the line of argument adopted by the reviewer is admissible (for even in hypothesis some regard must be had to facts), I allow that the above, as well as any other attempt to meet the pretensions of science, must prove abortive. It is one thing to discuss the facts and statements of science, and another to attempt to grasp an intangible hypothesis. In the present instance I was apparently expected, not only to deal with the matter in hand, but to have anticipated an hypothesis which is neither part of Baron Bunsen's nor of Sir C. Lyell's theory, and which cannot be the reviewer's own contention, viz. 1st, that the human race was born black; 2d, that it was born in Egypt.

Baron Bunsen's argument everywhere assumes the propagation of mankind from some point in Central Asia. Sir C. Lyell nowhere treats the question systematically from an ethnological point of view, but regards us casually as he comes upon trace of us in his geological strata. Who, then, is the individual who will be found to maintain that the Egyptian remained black 'because he never left his home'? Will the reviewer himself? I will not ask it seriously, but for the sake of the argument; for how, then, can he be struck with horror (*Dublin Review*, p. 440) at the thought of this brand of blackness being indelibly impressed on the posterity of Chanaan? What! It is barely consistent with the Divine Goodness that Chanaan should have been struck black; yet it was not contrary to

* In discussing the question of 'The Endowment of Catholic Education,' the *Pall Mall Gazette*, Jan. 30th, 1879, says, 'Thirdly, there is a largely increased, and still increasing, number of men . . . who look at the matter from the academic point of view, and deny that the State has any right to subsidize false science and perverted history.'

the goodness of God to have created him black ! When, however, the reviewer comes to the close examination of the argument he adduces many weighty objections, which I admit demand careful consideration ; but to all the objections in various forms that the Almighty could not have struck men black for some crime, my reply is, But there exists a race of men who are black, who have this stamp of inferiority upon them. It is like the story of the man in the stocks. 'They *could not* put you in the stocks.' 'But, my good man, they have !'

I must further correct a misapprehension which pervades his criticism. He treats the argument as De Maistre's. I, of course, do not give it as especially my argument ; for, on the contrary, I contend that it is the traditional view, and, as the reviewer points out, it was the view of the Schoolmen.

I am not aware, however, that De Maistre has anywhere specifically discussed the problem of the black races. But De Maistre, in the long extract which I have given at p. 283, *Tradition, &c.* (*vide* also on this point, Père A. J. Thebaud's *Gentilism*, p. 95 ; also the *Month*, July and August 1876), shows how it is likely that in the early ages mankind were intellectually and physically more plastic and intuitive, endowed with higher moral faculties, and charged with heavier responsibilities. This may go far to explain the possibility of punishments such as tradition seems to record in the case of Chanaan. It is to this extent only that I invoked the authority of De Maistre.

I think I have still greater reason to demur to the criticism of the following passage in the review (p. 443): 'Lord Arundell quotes Macaulay and Malthus. But Macaulay did not understand Bentham, and Malthus is clearly unintelligible to Lord Arundell. A man who thinks infanticide the Malthusian method to prevent over-

population is carrying either his learning or his reason very loosely about him.'

It seems to me incredible that I should have to state, in so many words, that I never for a moment said or supposed that infanticide was either justified or contemplated by Malthus; and in fear of farther misapprehension I will add that I fully believe that Malthus only intended legitimate economical checks. Nay, a man may be a Malthusian and a very good Christian; in good truth, if you wish to see Malthusianism practised in perfection you must go to the monasteries and convents.

But *if* a Malthusian is not a Christian, *if* he believes that mankind are only distinguishable by gradation from the brutes, and *if* he has no higher standard than utilitarianism, *then* I insist that, supposing the legitimate economical checks exhausted, *if* infanticide is the only means to the end, there is nothing in the utilitarian doctrine of morals to interdict it. But I will quote my own words: 'I will take another test of Benthamism by Darwinism, which will more exactly bring out the argument for which I contend. We have a traditional horror of infanticide which revolts all our best feelings and shocks our principles. But if Mr. Darwin has demonstrated this struggle for existence existing from all time; *if also* we are disembarassed from all advertence to another world; *if*, farther, Mr. Malthus before Mr. Darwin has shown reason to believe that over-population is the cause of half the evils of this life,—*what is there in Benthamite principles* which should prevent our sacrificing these unconscious innocents to the greatest happiness of the greatest number? Nothing except the horror we should excite among mankind still imbued with the old superstitions! A person who did not hold to Mr. Malthus's views might demur; but a Malthusian, *who was also a disciple of Mr. Bentham*, could only hold back because his feelings were better

than his principles.' I think the reviewer will recognise in the sentence, 'A man who thinks infanticide the Malthusian method to prevent over-population,' &c., a little touch of what he terms 'heedless rhetoric;' and I shall be better prepared to accept the statement, 'that Lord Macaulay did not understand Bentham,' when I meet with a refutation of Lord Macaulay's essay on Mill, and his reply to the *Westminster* reviewer's 'Defence of Mill.' I can quite understand that an oversight of this sort may occur when, as my reviewer justly complains, a good deal of ground had to be gone over in the perusal, and the ground, as he says, 'in a high degree rugged and roadless.' I must add that the above extracts do not give a full or fair idea of the article in the *Dublin Review*, which in other directions and other respects was in an eminent degree careful and discriminating.

The *Dublin Review* (third series, No. I.), Jan. 1879, p. 184, article 'The Evangelisation of Africa,' has the following passage bearing on the subject above discussed: 'It has been popularly supposed that the black complexion of the children of Cham was the effect of the curse pronounced by Noe, and that the poor Africans are a perpetual witness by their colour to this curse. It is true that Noe pronounced no blessing on Cham, and that he cursed Chanaan; but on the one hand the Chanaanites are white, not black, and on the other, the Aryan races of India, generally supposed to be Japhetic, are black. There are also black Jews on the coast of Malabar, to say nothing of the Portuguese descendants of the first settlers, who, perhaps, by intermingling of races, have become the blackest of the black. It cannot, therefore, be argued that blackness of skin has any connection whatever with the curse.'

I can only suppose that the present inhabitants of the land of Chanaan are here referred to; but will anybody

identify them with the descendants of Chanaan, of whom there is question? Of course if it were known that the latter were white the discussion would never have arisen; but where is the evidence? Again, it is said that the Aryans are black. The Aryan race, the same race as our own, are olive-coloured. No ethnologist classes them with the black races. When dark they are not black in the sense in which the negro is called black, viz. that he is the same negro that we find him on the Egyptian monuments B.C. 2400 (vide *Tradition*, p. 78). We have, on the other hand, the intrinsic evidence of the Vedas, that the Aryans on their first appearance in India (vide Hunter's *Bengal*, pp. 110-114) were a fair-complexioned race, and piqued themselves upon their colour. Moreover the argument in the *Dublin Review* ignores the evidence given in *Tradition*, pp. 36-38, 84, that the Aryans had the very sentiment against the black races, as being black, which the tradition of the curse seems only adequate to explain. Is there any other theory upon which the appearance of the negro on the Egyptian monuments B.C. 2400 can be explained consistently with any accepted theory of scriptural chronology?

The existence of 'black Jews' does not affect the ethnological argument; for Captain Richard Burton has informed us (I think in his *Mission to the King of Dahome*) that they are only the native blacks whom the Jews locally admitted or procured to make up the number of their synagogue.

Allowing for the influence of climate, and supposing the facts as alleged to stand, it would not get rid of the idea of a curse. It would only shift the discussion to the ground of preordained geographical location—which I have discussed at p. 89. I would here remark, from this point of view, that the black races in India occupy, and have for centuries occupied, the hills where the geogra-

phical conditions (if it were not an affair of race) ought to tend to produce the lighter colour.

I have fully admitted that the curse does not necessarily make the negro the most degraded race. Other races have prevaricated, and have degenerated, it may be, to lower depths.

In conclusion, we must thank the Bishop of Salford for the valuable tradition which he gives in the same article of the descent of the Foulahs from Phuth, the son of Ham or Cham, and that 'they have prefixed his name to almost every district of any extent they have occupied, e.g. Futa-Terro, near Senegal; Futa-Bondu and Futa-Jallon on the north-east of Sierra Leone' (Wilson's *Western Africa*).

APPENDIX B (p. 52).

THE following extracts from the journal of Mr. Moseley (*Notes by a Naturalist on the Challenger*, H. N. Moseley: Macmillan, 1879) will at least show that Kotzebue actually saw what he described, and that his narrative was not an invention. It is true that the same or similar objects do not appear to have suggested the same ideas to Mr. Moseley. This may either have been because the figures were more rudely carved, or because the traditions on the Admiralty Islands were more debased than in the Mariana group; or it may even be that the recollections of Adam and Eve had become more effaced in the minds of the officers of the Challenger than they were in the mind of Kotzebue. P. 473: 'There are several temples in Wild Islands [in the Admiralty group discovered 1767] . . . One such had as door-posts a male and female figure roughly carved in wood, but elaborately ornamented with incised

patterns and colours. Between the legs of the female figure was represented a fish. [Compare, *sup.* p. 52; also *Tradition*, pp. 197, 199, 202; also *infra*, pp. 173, 174.] I saw an Admiralty Island man with one side only of his face reddened. In Fiji *at dances* it is common to see natives with one lateral half of the face blue and the other red or black. [Compare the Mandan Diluvian Ceremony in Catlin, vide *Tradition*, pp. 259, 254.] Another temple had no figures, but four large drums already mentioned. [Compare Mandan Diluvian Ceremony, *Tradition*, pp. 256-7]. . . . When I began sounding the big drums in the Temple, my guides hastily drew me out of the place in terror, and made signs that the people from the chief group of houses would come and cut our throats: . . . a mystery always made about the principal temple containing the images.'

APPENDIX C (p. 73).

WITH reference to this 'middle earth,' Mr. G. Webbe Dasent (*Popular Tales from the Norse*, p. lvii.) writes as follows: 'We are enabled to trace . . . the natural and rational development of the creed of the heathen Norsemen from a simple worship of Nature and her powers, first to monotheism, and then to a polytheistic system. The tertiary system of polytheism is the soil out of which the mythology of the Eddas sprang, though through it each of the older formations crops out in huge masses, which admit of no mistake as to its origin. . . . According to this creed, Æsir and Odin had their abode in Asgard, a lofty hill in the centre of the habitable earth, in the midst of Midgard. That *middle earth* which we hear of in early English poetry, the abode of gods and men.

Round that earth, which was fenced in against the attacks of ancient and inveterate foes by a natural fortification of hills, flowed the great sea in a ring; and beyond that sea was Utgard, the outlying world, the abode of frost and giants and monsters—those old natural powers who had been dispossessed by Odin and the Æsir when the new order of the universe arose, and between whom and the new gods a feud, as inveterate as that cherished by the Titans against Jupiter, was necessarily kept alive.’ Mr. Desent’s theory is on the same lines with Mr. Max Müller’s, which we shall presently discuss, p. 78; and all that Mr. Desent probably means here is, that he finds an admixture of monotheism and nature-worship in their most ancient poems. But if the mythology of nature in the poems would appear to coincide with reminiscences of the disturbance of nature at the Diluvian period, and if I have more directly connected the Edda with that period, by its resemblances to the Chaldean Diluvian legend, we shall be entitled to come to our own conclusions as to the priority of nature-worship or monotheism. I have also noted the resemblances of the Edda to the Indian mythology; but I find that this had been already remarked, in other respects, by Stanley Faber, in his *Origin of Pagan Idolatry*. I give the following passage, which has especial bearing on the above extract from Desent, premising that Utgard, ‘the outlying world, the abode of frost and giants and monsters,’ would correspond with the traditions of the antediluvian world (vide *Tradition*, p. 128), and ‘the new order of the universe’ would be the new order after the Deluge. S. Faber (*O.P.I.* i. p. 220) says :

‘The central fortress which the gods constructed from the eyebrows of Ymer, and which towered from the midst of the earth, equally distant on all sides from the sea, is certainly the Meru of the Hindoos and Indo-Scythæ, which is described in a manner precisely similar. Accordingly, as the Goths termed the flat summit of

this holy abode the plain of Ida, so the Hindoo mythologists denominate it *Ida-vratta*, or the circle of *Ida*. It was the peculiar residence of the hero-gods immediately after the Deluge; and it is at once described with all the characteristics of a Paradise, and is represented as a fortress which might secure the deities against any further attacks from the giants. This lofty abode seems very evidently to be the mountain upon which the Ark rested, and which (there is reason to believe) coincides even geographically with the pristine terrestrial Paradise. The giants, against whom it was to secure the gods, are the impious antediluvians, the rebellious Titans of Greek mythology. . . It is a curious circumstance that the double character of *Ymer*, both as the World and the great father, is most accurately set forth in the Gothic cosmogony. He is plainly the Earth, because the blood which spouted out from his body when he was slain both declared to be the water of the deluge, and when the world was subsequently reproduced out of his body is said to have become the ocean. Yet he is also represented as the first man, from whom descended a race of wicked giants, . . . until, with the exception of a single family, which was preserved in a ship, they were swept away by the waters of the flood. Now this is the precise character of the great hermaphrodite parent.' I. p. 217: 'It is observable that in exact accordance with the prevailing doctrine of a succession of worlds, though the death of *Ymer*, or, in other words, the dissolution of the antediluvian world over which the great father *Adam* presided, is unequivocally and literally described as synchronising with the Deluge, yet the creation even of the whole universe is said to be posterior to that event. "Many winters before the earth was fashioned," says the author of the *Voluspa*, "was *Bergelmer* born; and well I know that this sage was preserved on board his bark." *Bergelmer* is evidently *Noah*, considered as a reappearance of *Adam*.' *Adam* and *Noah* were each the father of three sons; these triads passed into mythology. In the end it came to be said that the great father had triplicated himself. As to the legendary connection of Paradise and *Ararat* (the site of both being traditionally the same), with consecrated lakes and islands, *Faber* says (i. p. 358): 'The answer to this question is not very difficult. As the waters of the Deluge retired, the summit of the paradisiacal mount emerged as an island from the great deep; and after it had thus emerged it received within the recesses of what had once been the sacred garden another island, even the floating island of the Ark. The sea-girt top, then, of *Ararat*, and the ark of the chief hero-god, are the isles of the blessed, when those isles are mentioned plurally.'

I have given these passages at some length, as Stanley Faber's work, *Origin of Pagan Idolatry*, has become scarce—as I found on making search for it—since the publication of my book on *Tradition*. It contains very solid matter; and if read now would perhaps have a better chance of appreciation than at the date of publication.

I have no wish to disguise that two objections may be made to the views of Stanley Faber. It may be said that his view of Hindoo mythology is based on Colonel Wilford's (*vide supra*, p. 17). But it is based (in part) on Colonel Wilford's article on the 'Isles of the West' (*Asiatic Researches*, vol. viii.). In reply, I beg to remind the reader that this is the article in which Colonel Wilford makes his frank avowal of the deception practised on him, and in which he states the extent of the falsifications, and collects the waifs and strays, and what he deemed really valuable and intact, from the *débris* of the wreck. If there is deception here, it is of Colonel Wilford's own manufacture. Now it seems unnecessary to say that Colonel Wilford's honour has never been impeached; and that he was a competent Sanskrit scholar, according to his day, was sufficiently attested by Sir W. Jones.

The second and graver objection will be, that Hindoo mythology is mixed up with phallic symbolism. But it is not necessary to discuss this. It seems to me sufficient to reply that this can be shown to be secondary, and consequently of comparatively recent date. It must be secondary for all who believe in Genesis, and who are able to perceive that the traditions of Adam and the Creation, of Noah and the Deluge, and the Tower of Babel are in the background of the legend; and for those who do not, it suffices to reply that mountains and ships, although they may be clumsily brought into this symbolism (and as Colonel Wilford remarks, 'enthusiasts

among the Hindoos see this principle everywhere'), are not likely to have been its natural and primary expression; whereas, if mountains and ships had originally been associated with mountains, and then the renovation of the world with ships, we can see the way 'in which these objects would be impressed into their phallic symbolism, when speculation as to creation had degenerated into 'grovelling amidst grossness.'*

This suggestion will be much strengthened by the corroborative evidence I shall now adduce. I think it can be shown that traces of the mythology, which at some period collected the traditions of Paradise and Ararat, to hang like a halo of the mist on the mountain-tops, and which we have just seen in Scandinavia, must have drifted also to Africa and America.

I will ask the reader who has become acquainted with the ancient State of Meroë (in Heeren's *Historical Researches*, *African Nations*, or elsewhere) to believe that that distant and isolated people, surrounded by water and the desert, who formed the kingdom which stands remotely and mysteriously in the background of Egyptian civilisation, which was so frequently the subject of classic reference, but of which so little was known, was organised in embodiment of this tradition, and that its name was the name with which we have just become familiar, and which was retained with reference to the traditional Meru.

The tradition is one thing, the name another. The name, it is true, would not do more than connect the

* Herodotus (ii. 53) says, 'But it is not from the Egyptians, but from the Pelasgi, that the Athenians, and *after them* the other Greeks, derived the custom of giving to the statues of Mercury a phallic attitude, the religious reason of which may be found explained in the mysteries of Samothrace;' and although Sir G. Wilkinson believes they borrowed it from the Pan of Chemmis, the above still remains the opinion of Herodotus, who probably had his information from the Egyptian priests.

legend with the tradition, as we find it in India, and suggest that it came from India. But here we may very well find ourselves at fault; for within the same geographical limits we come upon the names of Assur and Sennaar and Accad, which would incline us to the belief that the tradition came direct from the plains of Babylon. I can even suppose that another theory might plausibly be sustained, viz. that it was the tradition of Meroë, brought back to India, which gave rise in India to the legend of Mount Meru and the island of Meru. Even in this case the tradition would be common to Africa and Scandinavia.

Heeren (*Historical Researches, African Nations, &c.*, 1847, pp. 171, 172) says :

‘Meroë has been celebrated for upwards of two thousand years, but its distant situation has always involved it in mystery and obscurity. It is only within this last ten years that the dark cloud under which it has so long been hid has been dispersed by the hardy enterprises of Burkhardt and Caillaud, more particularly the latter. Meroë, however, did not appear alone; a new world of antiquities, whose existence had not even been imagined, was laid open to the view of the astonished spectator.’

The people of Meroë were commonly referred to as Ethiopians. There was much misconception in the use of this term in antiquity, which was made to include not only the negro races, ‘but all who were strikingly distinguished from Europeans by a very dark or completely black skin;’ and yet, as Heeren tells us, Herodotus (iii. 114) speaks of the Ethiopians ‘as the tallest, most beautiful, and long-lived of the human race.’ This description is recognisable in the accounts of the modern Nubians. Heeren places the site of Meroë near the junction of the Nile and Tacazza (Astaboras). ‘The Nile,’ says Strabo (p. 1134), ‘receives two great rivers, which run from the east out of some lakes, and encompass the great island of Meroë. One is called the Astaboras, . . . the other Astapus.’ Here

we have the 'island of Meroë' just as we have 'the island of Asgard' and 'the island of Meru.' The difficulty, I confess, is that Meroë is really, and not only mythologically, an island; and this fact would rather favour the last hypothesis I suggested; and yet, if they had brought the traditions, or corresponding traditions, of Meru and Asgard from the plains of Sennaar, the geographical position might have been selected in recollection of the tradition, and from predilection arising out of it; and it must be noted that Meroë is not merely isolated by rivers, but, as Bruce tells us, in the rainy season becomes 'a complete island'—the city of Meroë—about two miles distant (Heeren, p. 198) from the confluence, as must be inferred, being on elevated ground. Bruce mentions the ruins of Meroë in connection with Mount Gibbainy, and where apparently a colony from Meroë is founded—it is near Mount Berkal (Heeren, p. 221). 'Here evidently stood a sort of second Meroë; indeed, even the very name obtained here, the village being still called Marawé;' and at this place also were found 'the remains of two temples.' Here we see the name again following with the propagation of the worship.

But Sabhá was also 'a name for Meru' (*Asiat. Res.* viii. p. 283). Now it may be doubtful whether Herodotus (Heeren, pp. 171, 231), in his description of the Ethiopians as 'the most long-lived and tallest of the human race,' intended the people of Meroë or the people of Saba ('the Sabæans, men of stature,' Isaiah xlv. 14); but if Sabhá is the same as Saba, and is also a name for Meru, the difficulty will disappear, as we may believe them to be kindred people.

Let us pursue the investigation, and see if we can discover any other names, in connection with the island of Meroë, tending to identify it with the Indian legend of Meru.

Now we observe that *Kurgos** has the same geographical relation to Meroë (and in its connection with the dead the same mythological relation) that *Kuru* in the Indian plan of the world has to Meru. But also the opposite point (viz. the south) to *Kuru* is Bharata. Now Atbar (Barat and Atbar are apparently cognate) is the name of the province that at present occupies the position of the ancient Meroë. There is a likelihood of Bharata or Atbar occupying the place of Meroë, as *Kurgos* was outside the limits of Meroë, and to the north of it, as *Kuru* was the extreme north (and Bharata the extreme south) in the Indian scheme. Curiously also, one of the 'dwipás' or divisions of the world in the Indian plan is Naga; and we find the identical name 'Naga or Naka' the site of one of the principal group of temples, and, as Heeren supposes, the metropolis of the priest caste. Naga in Africa (except that it is south-east instead of south-west) would relatively occupy the same position to Meroë as Naga to Meru in the Indian plan; so also would the remaining temple of Messura correspond with 'the sea of Sura or Ira' (*Asiat. Res.* viii. p. 297), as indicated by Cusa on the

* I think that the resemblance of 'Kurn' to 'Kurgos' may be still more closely traced. I must postulate that the letters K and G are interchangeable, as the following variants would seem to show: 'Kuva,' variant of 'Gova' (Wilson's *Vishnu Purana*, ii. 164). 'Kuveñá,' of 'Tungaveñá' (ii. 150). 'Gachchhas,' of 'Kakshas' (ii. 176). 'Kanganila,' of 'Kamkanika' (ii. 293).

We have become acquainted with 'Utgard' in the Scandinavian literature in contrast with 'Asgard' (or Meru); and similarly we find in the *Vishnu Purana* mention (both as a region and people) of 'Uttarakurn' (ii. 112, 339) and *Uttarakosala* (ii. 157, 145). Now if 'Kosala' should have become, as above, 'Gosala,' we should not be surprised to find these two regions and people run into one, when referred to from the central point Meru—thus, *Uttarakurgosala*, and with lapse of time *Kurgos*. The following names in the vicinity of Meroë correspond with names mentioned in connection with the mythology of Meru—'Chandi' (identical), 'Mandera' with 'Mandara.'

Also the diagram of the Mangaian scheme of the universe in Mr. Wyatt Gill's *Myths of the South Pacific*, p. 2, has resemblances with the Hindoo diagrams in the eighth volume of *Asiatic Researches*.

maps, which it is said to surround. I must, moreover, note, whilst we find 'Asta' as a mountain-range in the Indian scheme (Wilson, *Vishnu Purana*, ii. p. 199), we have *Astaboras* and *Astapus* as the two rivers which bound Meroë.

Now what were these temples and the worships practised in them? From my point of view I should say there was originally the worship of the true God, worshipped as Amun-re (or ra) as creator, and in commemoration and in record of creation rather than in expression of his essence or attributes; along with, among other symbol commemorations of the creation and of Paradise and the Deluge, a representation of Adam and Noah, run into one in the impersonation of Osiris. In other words, that Amun-re and Osiris (in different grades of conception) were the original and primitive objects of worship and regard, the 'protoplasms,' so to speak, of the subsequent idolatry, and of the eight greater gods and innumerable lesser gods; in fact, of the whole pantheon.

As I have (p. 78) discussed the question of the primitive monotheism of the Egyptians, and as this is also the view of Sir G. Wilkinson (second series of *Manners and Customs of the Egyptians*, i. 179-209), and as the proof of what is special in the above views would require a lengthened argument, I shall here confine myself to the representations of Osiris, as I think Sir J. G. Wilkinson is wrong in regarding him merely as one of the attributes of the Divinity. In speaking of Osiris I intend also Isis*

* Tacitus (*Germ.* ix.) says, 'Pars Suevorum Isidi sacrificat.' Mr. Latham in his valuable note says, 'I believe that the goddess here noticed (Isis) was identified with the Egyptian on the strength of her name only;' and in support of his opinion 'that she was Slavonic,' he quotes a poet of the fourteenth century, who mentions 'a goddess named Zisa, who was worshipped by the inhabitants of the parts about Augsburg.' But just as Mr. Latham identifies the word 'Isis' with 'Zisa,' we, from our point of view, may identify Zisa with Isis, and remain indebted to Mr. Latham for proving the still wider extent of her worship. As from our point of

(Eve), his sister and wife (comp. p. 53-56 *sup.*), and I will at once concede that they both also have their associations with the sun and moon.

As this is a point which I think has been fully established by Stanley Faber's *Origin of Pagan Idolatry*, I will quote him in the first instance (ii. p. 231). He says :

'Agreeably to the doctrine of a succession of similar worlds, each of which alike commenced with a universal father and three sons, who had floated on the surface of a preceding deluge, the person worshipped in the sun [Osiris] was not simply Noah, but Noah viewed as a transmigratory reappearance of Adam; nor yet merely Noah as a reappearance of Adam alone, but Noah considered as one of the numerous manifestations of the great father.' 'In Egypt the transmigrating patriarch was denominated Osiris;' reduplicated in Horus. 'If Horus be constrained by Typhon to take refuge in a floating island, Osiris is similarly compelled by him to enter into a floating ark. . . . If Isis wanders over the world in quest of Horus, she makes exactly the same search for the lost Osiris. . . . The day on which the Egyptian priesthood supposed Osiris to have been shut up in the ark was the seventeenth day of the month Athyr. Now if we suppose Moses to have reckoned by the civil year of the Jews, which commenced from the autumnal equinox, this will be the *precise* day of the *precise* month on which Noah entered the Ark (*vide* Plutarch de Iside, p. 356); or if by their ecclesiastical year.' [In doubt, apparently, the Egyptians appointed two annual festivals.] 'By this expedient, therefore, of a double festival, they were sure to celebrate what they called the enclosure of Osiris within his coffin

view the worship may as well have come from India as from Egypt, the ethnological difficulty is not the same. Mr. Latham says she is identified by 'her name only.' His poem, on the contrary, shows that she was worshipped on a mountain. 'They built a great temple therein to the honour of Zisa. . . When it from age went off, the *hill* took the name from it, whereon the work stood, and still hight Zisenberg;' and also it appears that she was worshipped in connection with a ship, '*navigium Isidis*;' and though not in connection with Isis so far as transpires, yet, as he informs us, in Rodolf's *Chronicle of the Abbey of St. Trudo*, A.D. 1133, it is stated that the country people in the neighbourhood made a ship, put it on wheels, rolled it about from town to town, and attended it with song and dance from Tongres to Louvain. Another writer, Jean le Maire, 1512, refers to the German tradition of Isis having taught them to grind corn, &c., as is said of Osiris in Egypt.

on the very day of the very month of Noah's enclosure within the Ark' (p. 242).

Here I may remark that Sir G. Wilkinson (*Manners and Customs of the Egyptians*, second series, i. p. 194) notices that the Egyptians have 'a great detestation for the number 17;' and although he adds, 'they call the 17th day of the month the day of obstruction' (italics mine), and accounts for it on mathematical grounds, does not the phrase, taken in connection with the number, seem to bear allusion to the above ceremonial?

Whilst skilfully disentangling the tradition from the meshes of the later pantheism, Mr. William Palmer's *Egyptian Chronicles* (i. p. 2) substantially accords with this view:

'The first human pair having been thrown back into pairs of anthropomorphous deities, the original Osiris and Isis, formed by the divine potter as parents of all' ['Sitting as a potter at a wheel, Cneph (at Philæ) moulds clay, and gives the spirit of life to the nostrils of Osiris'], 'disappear in name, and are represented by Seb and Nutpe; while Osiris, Typhon, and Horus, the progeny of Seb and Nutpe, answer rather to Cain, Abel, and Seth in the old world, and to the three sons of Noah in the new. At any rate, Osiris blends together the characters of Adam as the protoplast, of Abel as literally slain by his brother (for the slayer of Adam could only by metaphor be called a brother), of Noah as the father of husbandmen and vinedressers and of the existing world. From Osiris-Seb (whether he be viewed as Adam or Noah) are derived downwards all the successive generations of Egyptian gods and demigods, patriarchs, kings, and other men. . . . So each ancestor in turn went, it was said, to the original Osiris as patriarch of the dead and to his intermediate "Osirified" fathers, and was himself Osirified like them.' This is said with reference to their cycles. 'The idea of a succession of worlds, and of a certain period of time ending the existing world and introducing a new one, is common to the mythologies of India and Egypt. Whether derived from early prophecy or by generalisation from the fact that the world had already once ended and recommenced at the Flood, this idea had a foundation in truth.'

Mr. W. Palmer (i. 38) tells us that 'the epoch of the

Flood was by no means to be named or even directly alluded to by any Egyptian; and any of their legends of the Deluge taken separately—Herod. *Hist.* lib. ii. c. 69, or Herod. ii. c. 4; *Izetz. in Lycoph.* v. 177, or Plato, *Timæus*, fol. 22, 23 (Stanley Faber, ii. p. 138-195)—might pass as partial deluges or inundations of the Nile; yet, taken collectively, they convey the impression of a tradition of the general Deluge.

Before reverting to Heeren and the evidence of the monuments at Meroë, I think it may be useful to add some additional evidence as to Osiris. The following passage from Wilkinson (id. p. 189) shows Typhon in connection with Osiris, not only as typical of the general disturbance and destruction at the Deluge, but as representing the serpent in Paradise: 'It is remarkable that, in this character of the manifestation of the Deity, Osiris was said to be "full of goodness (grace) and truth;" and after having performed his duties on earth, and fallen a sacrifice to the machinations of (Typho) the evil one, to have assumed the office, in a future state, of judge of mankind.'

Osiris (Wilkinson, id. p. 324) was identified by the Greeks with Bacchus (Bacchus=Noah, vide *Tradition*, p. 214). Now Plutarch, citing Sosthenes, says that Dionusus (Bacchus) was born on Mount Argillus. Faber (ii. 267) adds that Mount Argillus is the same as Mount Meru; 'for the word is compounded of Argha and Ila, equally titles of the ship-goddess that delights to haunt the summit of the holy mountain'—'the top of Meru being styled Ila-vratta, or circle of Ila.' And H. H. Wilson (in his *Vishnu Purana*, ii. 111, 115, &c.) speaks of it (Ilāvrita) reversely as 'the region in the centre of which stands Mount Meru.' This brings us back to our starting-point, the island of Meroë, and to Heeren's theory, that its civilisation and religious worship descended down the

Nile to Egypt from Meroë. If so, we see the religion and its ceremonial in its primitive stages. Let us read, then, the following passage with reference to the view of the Egyptian worship which I ventured to take (p. 165), and in the light of the legend that Dionusus was born on Mount Meru. 'The only gods worshipped in Meroë,' says Herodotus (ii. 29), 'are Zeus [*vide supra*] and Dionysos (which he himself explains to be Ammon and Osiris). They also have an oracle of Ammon, and undertake their expeditions when and how the god commands.' Heeren, pp. 207-210 (who believes the oracle in question 'to be the ancient oracle of Jupiter Ammon'). Diodorus Siculus (l. iii.) tells us that the Ethiopians valued themselves upon their being the first nation that had a religious establishment, which accords both with Heeren's view as to its being the fountain-head of Egyptian civilisation, and also with my theory of its tradition of Mount Meru. In further testimony that Ammon-re—pronounced *ra* (Wilkinson)—and Osiris were the original nucleus of their worship or idolatry, I might quote a passage from Strabo to the effect that the Ethiopians acknowledged an immortal god, who was the first principle of all things, and a mortal god who had no name; but I cannot at this moment verify the quotation.

I know not whether I have produced conviction in the mind of the reader; but it appears to me that the most striking evidence, taken in connection with what has preceded (although I am only stating what is already well known, and yet not perhaps quite realised), is that the one tangible object of worship or regard which the monuments reveal, beyond the impersonation of abstractions and traditions, is the ark, in the model of a boat* within

* In the dispersed traditions of the Deluge we so frequently hear of the survivors as saved 'in a boat.' May not this have its explanation in the ceremonial or commemorative boats in the temples, condensing the tradition within those limits?

the 'sanctum' of all these temples. I will proceed to extract the evidence in Heeren :

'One thing is remarkable,' says Heeren, with reference to these early monuments, 'namely, that of all the representations of Nubia yet known, there is not one which, according to our notions, is offensive to decency' (p. 209).

p. 210. 'In the sanctuary stands a ship. Upon it many holy vessels; but above all in the midst a portable tabernacle, surrounded with curtains which may be drawn back. In this is an image of the god, set, according to Diodorus, in precious stones; nevertheless, according to one account, it would have no human shape.*'

'The ship in the great temples seems to have been very magnificent. . . . This ship is often represented both upon the Nubian and Egyptian monuments, sometimes standing still, and sometimes carried in procession; but never anywhere except in the innermost sanctuary, which was its resting-place. . . . These processions are not only seen upon the great Egyptian temples at Philæ, Elephantis, and Thebes, but also upon the great oasis.'

In remarking on the smallness of the principal temple at Meroë, he conjectures that 'it was probably a place merely for the preservation of the sacred ship, which stood between the pillars of the sanctuary.' Heeren's view, however, is very remote from ours. His view (p. 209) of Ammon and his kindred gods is that 'this worship had its origin in natural religion connected with agriculture;' and his theory of 'the sacred ship' is as follows (p. 211) :

'The sacred ship was therefore the oracle ship; and wherever we discover it, we may conclude that an oracle of Ammon was or should be there. But it is naturally asked, How came this idea of ships? The answer seems almost as naturally to present itself. For as we have already seen, and shall still further see, how the worship of Ammon spread along the Nile by the foundation of temples and colonies, can we in these ships and these processions see anything plainer than the *allegorical propagation of this worship in this manner?*'

* 'Umbilico similis' (Curtius, iv. 7). Heeren, however, 'doubts this statement, not only on account of the passage just quoted from Diodorus, but because we see on one of the common monuments a complete portrait of Ammon.'

But of what worship? Of the worship of Agriculture or Nature apart from the ship? But we have just seen his own statement that we find the ark or ship at the very starting-point: in other words, even if we saw force in the argument, we could only allow it to apply at Thebes or Philæ, but not at Meroë, at the fountain-head. Moreover the ship or ark was the most integral part of the worship—the tabernacle from which the oracular utterances came—the one conspicuous object in the processions and worship. The tabernacle, though partly in the form of a boat, carried an ark or chest; sometimes, indeed, it would appear that the boat carried the ark, sometimes the ark enclosed the boat. In no case is ‘the sacred ship’ represented like one of their boats for navigation, but is of mythical form, shaped like a lunette. Heeren himself tells us (p. 408) that

‘at Karnac the holy ship with the attributes of Ammon appears, and once in a very remarkable representation; it is portrayed as being drawn along by a *profane vessel which precedes it*; a clear proof, therefore, that it must not be considered here as borne in procession, but as merely voyaging on the Nile.’

But clear evidence also that no peculiar sanctity attached ‘to the profane vessel,’ or to the fact or incidents of ‘the propagation of the worship.’

I have discussed this point at some length as it is the only explanation of the symbol (the ship) that I have seen put forward, except those which are connected with the voyages of Osiris with the sun, which, from our point of view, must have been among the freaks of imagination at later date.

If, again, the Egyptian temples afforded the only instances of ship worship or reverence, the local explanation suggested might suffice; but I think Heeren’s own pages will let us into the secret that it is not so. When, in the period of the Ptolemies, ‘the ruler of Meroë overthrew

the dominion of the priests,' 'he went with an armed company to the retired spot where the sanctuary with the golden temple stood, surprised the priests and killed them.' Diodorus and Strabo use the expression τὸν χρυσοῦν ναόν. Heeren observes, in a note :

'If the reading be correct, a small portable temple must be meant which belonged to the sacred vessels. I scarcely, however, have a doubt that we should read ναυς instead of ναος, . . . and then translate it the golden ship. It will be shown hereafter that this could not fail to be in all the oracle temples of Ammon. As this corrupt reading might,' &c.

As we are now (as several adverse theories might concur in admitting) among the earliest evidence or the earliest commencements of religious worship, it may be worth while to add that the correction of Heeren suggests the further thought whether or not the word ναῦς, ship, or its equivalent at the epoch of the first construction of temples, did not in some way determine the name given to temples, according to the analogy of ναῦς and νᾶός. This remark may have to be restricted to covered temples; the Latin 'templum,' in its first sense, meaning the heavens, and being derived from the Greek Γεμνω, from the open space 'cut off' by the augur with his 'lituus.' But here I must again observe that the 'lituus' or crooked staff is one of the symbols of Ammon, and also of Osiris. Another ancient Greek term for a religious edifice, σηκος—in its first sense 'pen or fold'—may again be connected with the other symbol of Ammon—the ram (concerning which I will not at present digress). The more ordinary Greek term for temple, ἱερόν, may be set aside, as it is only used in the secondary sense of 'hallowed,' 'sacred.' *Ædes* or *ædis* primarily means a house; and its sense seems best expressed in the word we have derived from it, 'edifice.' I must here face the difficulty that νᾶός is commonly derived from ναίω = to dwell; but dwelling may very well have had its first

reference to temples. The temple would seem, according to Heeren, to have been constructed first, and then the dwellings to have clustered around it, or rather, in its vicinity. It is also in proof that there is scarcely any trace of the towns in Meroë: 'the dwellings of man have vanished, those of the gods remain.' For evidence of ship-temples in other parts of the world, *vide* Bryant's *Mythology*, ii. 221-240, and Stanley Faber, *O.P.I.* iii. 288 *et seq.* Faber (p. 295) adds: 'The very appellations, nave and choir, are strictly significant, and were certainly not adopted through mere accident. Nave signifies indifferently a temple and a ship.'

I think it may be interesting and even refreshing to find legends, analogous to the traditions we have been considering, still current at the present moment. The following extract from Mr. H. M. Stanley's letters from Ugigi in the *Daily Telegraph*, March 26, 1877, will show that the traditions of Paradise and the Deluge, as we have seen them in legends of Mount (and lake) Meru, still lurk in unexplored parts of Africa. Mr. Stanley tells us that:

'The Wajiji, a tribe now occupying a small country near the centre of the eastern coast of Tanganika—immigrants long since from Urimdi—have two [one geographical only] interesting legends respecting the origin of Lake Tanganika. The first relates that the portion of this continent now occupied by the Great Lake was a plain "years and years and years ago;" that on this plain was a large town, the site of which is not known [as on Mount Meru]. In this town lived a man and his wife, with an enclosure round their dwelling which contained a remarkably deep well or fountain [fountain of Paradise], whence an abundant supply of fresh fish was obtained for their wants. The existence of the fountain and its treasure was kept a profound secret. . . The revelation of its existence had been strictly prohibited by father to son for many generations within this particular family, lest some heavy calamity, dimly foretold, would happen. . . . The wife, however, was not very virtuous; . . . among other favours she frequently gave to her lover some of the fresh fish. . . . For a long time he ceased not to ask, while the woman steadily refused to tell. One day the husband was compelled to

begin a journey to Uvinza, but before his departure he strictly enjoined, &c. . . . The African Eve solemnly promised. . . . She showed him the fish [comp. *sup.* p. 157] and the wondrous fountain. For some time he gazed on the brilliant creatures with admiration; then seized with a desire to handle one of them he put his hand within the water, . . . when suddenly the well burst forth, the earth opened her womb, and soon an enormous lake replaced the plain.'

He adds :

'The Wagubba have also their tale, which is that a long time ago, near Urungu, there was a small *hill*, hollow within and very deep, full of water. This hill one day burst, and the water spread over the land, becoming a lake.'

I think it is impossible not to recognise the resemblance of these traditions to the legends as above of Mount and lake Meru. Moreover, in Mr. Stanley's letters there is frequent reference to a lake Moero or Mweru. He says, commenting upon Lieutenant Cameron's account, 'It is believed to flow into the Lualaba between lakes Moero and Kamarondo.' Stanley adds, 'More about the flow below; but *Moero is pronounced Mweru* by all men-natives or Arabs, and of Kamarondo I can hear nothing but a distinct denial of there being such a lake.' It does not much affect the argument whether there is a real or only a fabulous lake Moero or Mweru in those parts; for I would observe that, in the single distinct instance of colonisation from the ancient Meroë, the name followed, *vide* Heeren, p. 221. 'I speak of that near Mount Berkal. Here evidently stood a second Meroë; indeed even the name obtained here, the village being still called Merawé. At this place are found the remains of two temples dedicated to Osiris and Ammon.'

I could produce a very similar tradition to the one recorded by Stanley in connection with the ancient Saba (or Sabhâ), *sup.* p. 163. What is, perhaps, even more surprising, the almost identical legend (in its substance)

may be found in Brett's *Indian Tribes of Guiana*, p. 378:

'In the beginning of this world the birds and beasts were created by Makonaima—the great spirit whom no man hath seen. They at that time were all endowed with the gift of speech. Sigu, the son of Makonaima, was placed to rule over them. . . . The wild productions of the forest were then the only food of man and beast. But Makonaima, to surprise his creatures with his bounty, caused to spring out of the earth an enormous and wonderful tree producing different kinds of fruit. . . . The acouri first discovered this tree . . . and selfishly ate his fill without making it known for the public benefit. Sigu accordingly commissioned the woodpeckers to keep him in sight. . . . The rat was then sent forth. . . . Sigu cuts down the tree and replenishes the whole earth with the slips and seed. . . . Iwarrika, the monkey, refused to assist to keep him from doing harm. Sigu at last sent him to a stream to fetch water, giving him only a "quake" or open-work basket to bring it in. The stump of the wondrous tree was found to be hollow, and the cavity filled with water, containing the fry of every variety of fresh-water fish. Sigu determined to stock with them all the streams and lakes upon the earth; . . . but the water in the cavity, being connected with a subterranean fountain or reservoir, began to overflow. To stop its increase he hastily constructed a closely-woven basket of the kind called "wallampa," with which he covered the stump, and this restrained the swelling fountain within.' [I should have mentioned that in Stanley's narrative 'a fence of water-cane plastered over with mud enclosed the wondrous fountain.'] . . . 'Iwarrika, imagining it covered the choicest fruit, . . . hastily forced the magic cover; and in the next instant was gasping and struggling in abject terror and astonishment, being overturned and nearly drowned by a mighty torrent which burst forth, and from a rapidly enlarging aperture overspread the earth around.'

The legend continues. Brett adds that Washington Irving (*Life of Columbus*, vi. ch. x.) mentions 'the belief of the natives of Hayti that the waters of the universal Deluge burst forth from a large gourd.' Other traditions might be adduced, but it would be difficult to comprise them within the limits of an appendix note.

I may perhaps, however, in conclusion, be allowed to take the reader back to the point whence we started, viz.

the Polynesian group; and I will then request him to compare the following statements of Wilford with the narrative of Captain Cook's first voyage to Otaheite. Wilford (*Asiatic Researches*, viii. p. 289) gives instances of conical or pyramidal structures, both Hindoo and Buddhist (there are four in or near Benares), intended, as in one instance an inscription states, 'as a representation of the worldly Meru, the hill of God.' These structures had seven steps or zones. 'The seven zones and ranges of mountains are arranged by the Hindoos like so many steps, rising gradually one above another in such manner that Meru looks like an immense pillar or obelisk with a base, either circular or square, and consisting of seven steps, but according to others of eight or even nine.' Wilford compares it to the tower of Babel 'in seven stages or zones,' and this comparison is borne out by more recent investigation. Assuming the traditional Birs-Nimroud to be identical with the tower restored by Nebuchodonosor, and this tower to have occupied the site of the tower of Babel, as is recognised by Rawlinson (if my recollection is correct) and by Lenormant, the account of the ruins and the record of the restoration correspond with the above descriptions of Meru; and I must remind the reader in regard to the latter that an inscription has been found within recent years (*vide* F. Lenormant, *Frag. Cosmogoniques de Berosé*, pp. 349-351). In this important inscription it is stated that 'the temple of the seven lights of the earth, the monument of the reminiscences of Borsippa, has been constructed by *the most ancient king*;' and the inscription adds that since 'the days of the Deluge' it has been abandoned, and that rain and tempests had scattered the materials. Moreover, Lenormant says that the Chaldean syllables of the word 'Borsippa' (at first rendered 'the tower of languages') import 'stammer' and 'speech,' and he accordingly translates the name 'la ville du balbutiement des paroles'—'on

ne saurait trouver une expression plus nette de la tradition de la confusion des langues.' Babylon also (Lenormant, p. 350) is 'the gate of the god Ilu,' which again corresponds to Ila-vratta or Meru; and regarding Meru, Lenormant says (p. 317), 'The conception of the holy and paradisiacal mountain situated in the north' [in some legends in the north, in others in middle earth], 'higher than all the mountains of the earth' [as Ararat would have been in recollection], 'column of the world, round which revolved the seven stars of the Great Bear, compared to the seven planetary bodies, this notion, which was common to Meru, Harâ-Berezriti' [Zend-avesta], 'and the primitive Aryaratha' [Armenia], 'was certainly known and recognised by the Chaldeans' (p. 317). Lenormant describes the tower of Borsippa as in steps or stories—'la tour à étages' (compare Meru, *sup.* p. 176). He adds, 'Let us return to our tower or pyramid in stages at Borsippa. Having regard to its prodigious antiquity, we may regard it as having been, along with the tower of Babylon, the prototype of all the religious edifices of the ancient empire of Chaldea, which invariably reproduce the same indications of a pyramid in stages composed of a series of high terraces' [probably corresponding to the 'paradêças' (Sanskrit) and 'paradâcêṣ' (Zend)=paradises, *vide* Lenormant, p. 319-320] 'in squares or parallelograms: . . . upon the highest platform rose a small chapel or square chamber, richly ornamented, in which was the image of the divinity of the temple.'

Let us now turn to the conspicuous religious edifice in Otaheite, which surprised Captain Cook, Mr. Banks, and Dr. Solander. 'They saw an immense edifice, which they found to be the *Morai* of Oamo and Oberea, the rulers of that part of the island. . . . It consisted of an enormous pile of stonework raised in the form of a pyramid, with a flight of steps on each side (comp. *sup.* p. 176),

something after the manner of those little buildings erected in England to place the pillars of sundials upon. It was near two hundred and seventy feet long and about one-third wide, and between forty and fifty feet high' (Pinkerton, xi. p. 514). 'They took this opportunity of walking out to a point upon which they had observed at a distance some trees called Etoa' [and 'small stages called Ewattas, which appeared to be altars;'] their gods are called 'Eatuas.' I note, for the purpose of comparison, that the name for 'the pyramid of Babylon' in one tablet is 'Tul Elatuv'—'*la colline du dieu Elatuv*:' vide Lenormant, p. 356], 'which usually grow on the burial-places of these people. They call these burial-grounds Morai, which are also places of worship' [the same question arising respecting the pyramids in Egypt and Meroë, vide Heeren]. 'The foundation consisted of rock-stones, the steps of coral, and the upper part of round pebbles, all of the same shape and size; the rock and coral stones were all squared with the utmost neatness and regularity. . . . In the centre of the summit was the representation of a bird carved in wood; close to this was a figure of a fish (comp. *sup.* p. 157), which was in stone. This pyramid made part of one side of a wide court or square, the sides of which are nearly equal; the whole was walled in and paved with flat stones. Within this place grew (notwithstanding it was in this manner paved) several plantains and trees, which the natives called Etoas. . . . Mr. Banks afterwards observed whole hogs placed upon these ewattas or altars.' 'One of their eatuas or gods' is elsewhere described: 'it was made of wicker-work, and resembled the figure of a man; it was seven feet in height, and was covered with black and white feathers; on the head were four protuberances, which the natives called "tate ete," or little men.' Where there are so many points in common in the description, I think we

may be entitled to rely also upon the resemblance in the name 'Morai' to Meru and to 'Meroë.'* I would observe that 'morai' is also the term applied (*sup.* p. 52) by Kotzebue to 'the sanctuary' in which he saw the statues reminding him of Adam and Eve. In conclusion, I must advert to the measurements of the 'morai' given by Cook. According to the mythical measurements of the fabulous Meru, given in the Puranas by Wilford, they ought to be 'in the proportion of eighty-four to sixteen,' or five to one; 'the length or height is to the breadth as eighty-four to sixteen' (*Asiat. Res.* viii. p. 289); to which the rough measurements of Captain Cook—viz. 'near two hundred and seventy feet long, and between forty and fifty feet high'—very closely correspond, only that the proportion is apparently traditionally kept in length to height, instead of in height to breadth.

* Lenormant agrees with Wilford: 'A mettre le nom de la montagne, sur laquelle avait été construit le temple Moriah, nom qui n'a aucune étymologie naturelle dans les langues Sémitiques, en rapprochement avec celui de Meru, le mont paradisiaque des Indiens, regardés aussi comme le point de départ de quatre fleuves' (Lenormant, *Frag. Cosmog. de Berosé*, p. 307).

INDEX.

- ABYDENUS** and Polyhistor, Testimony of, 85.
- Adam**, Cumulative testimony of tradition concerning, 43.
- Adam and Eve**, Inquiry that we are descendants of, 39.
- Alban Butler** on ladies' fashions, 94, 95.
- Allies**, Mr. T. W., Letter from, 9.
- American Continent**, Legends of the, 75.
- Amun-re and Osiris**, primitive objects of worship and regard, 165.
- Analogies**, Physical and historical, 27.
- Ancient traditions**, Value of the study of, 10.
- Argo**, Mr. Proctor on the constellation, 91, 92.
- Aryan race**, Primitive religious belief of, 9.
- Astronomical indications**, Argument from, 86.
- BABEL**, The building of the Tower of, 84.
- Babylonians**, The stellar observations of the, 103.
- Bancroft**, Mexican narration from, 75.
- Basis of science**, 8.
- Beachey**, Captain, on customs of South-Sea islanders, 61.
- Beaconsfield**, Lord, Curious passage from, 30.
- Bear**, The, Laftau, Proctor, and Gouget on, 98.
- Berosus**, his record of the Deluge, 13.
- Biblical and profane history**, Agreement between, 86.
- Black Jews**, 155.
- Bossippa**, The tower of, 177.
- Boulanger**, the friend of Voltaire, the Deluge, the foundation of his theories, 101.
- Brett's Indian Tribes of Guiana**, Legend from, 175.
- Bunsen**, Baron, his argument on the propagation of mankind, 151.
- CALCULUS** of inference, 34.
- Caroline group of islands**, Tradition on, 71.
- Catholic literature**, Mode of criticism in current, 142.
- Catholic youth**, Intellectual dangers to, 131.
- Centaur**, Alteration in the constellation, 90.
- Chaldean account and Genesis**, remarkable resemblance, 70; computation, 21; tablet, test of, 69.
- Chinese Zodiac**, its first constellation, 100.
- Christ**, The relation of the world before, to His mission and His Gospel, 117; varieties of testimony to, 118.
- Christian student**, The, his labours in search of the testimony to Christ, 118.
- Chronology**, Difficult period of, 19.
- Chronological argument** addressed to the Progressionists, 7.
- Chus (or Cush)**, 19.
- Civilisation**, Progressive advance of man to, 25.
- Classification of evidence**, 10.
- Clement of Alexandria** on the orgies of the Bacchantes, 66.
- Coincidences of thought**, 9.
- College of common resort**, Failure to establish, 131.
- Common sense**, its teaching concerning records and legends, 109.
- Configuration and position of certain constellations**, Variation in, 90, 91.
- Confusion of tongues** according to families, 84.
- Constellations**, The, Mr. Proctor's theory and standpoint, 87.
- Cook's**, Captain, measurements of the Moral, 179.
- Cumulative testimony of tradition** concerning Adam, 43.
- Cycle**, Cynic, 23; Sothic, 22.
- DARWIN** anticipated, 9.
- Darwinian position**, The force of the testimony against, 12.
- Darwinians**, A question to, 42.
- Darwinism**, Objections to, 127.
- Darrent**, Mr. G. Webbe, passage from

- his *Popular Tales from the Norse*, 157.
- Defective perception the cause of imperfect interest, 126.
- Defence of an outlying position, 48.
- Deluge, The, Aryan, Greek, Chinese records of, 16; traditions of, reduced to scientific groups, 16, 17; tablet and the Edda, comparison of, 73.
- De Maistre, on mankind in early ages, 152.
- De Morgan, his *First Notions of Logic*, 34.
- De Vere, Aubrey, iii, 18.
- Deucalion and the dove, Traditions of, 11; Legends of, 12.
- Displacement traceable in certain leading constellations, 91.
- Divine revelation, Value of the labours in systematising the testimony to, 137.
- Dublin Review*, passage from article on 'The Evangelisation of Africa,' 154.
- Duncker, Professor Max, passage from his *History of Antiquity*, 78.
- Dynasties, Speculations on Babylonian, 15.
- EDDA, Passage from the, 72.
- Elam, Dr., on embryology, 41; passage from the *Winds of Doctrine*, 111.
- Elton, The phrase, 'Many-languaged man,' 85.
- Eminent writers, Scientific value attached to traditions by, 10.
- End, The, aimed at in the contemplated 'Science of Tradition,' 123.
- Eneene and his wife Kura, Legend of, 53.
- Eve, Greek tradition of, 50.
- Eve (Ivi) among the Polynesians, 50.
- Etva, Etvas, 178.
- Evolution theory, The wide gulf of the, 26.
- Evolutionists, their obligation to show actual progress, 8; arrogance of the professed, 110.
- FABER, Stanley, passages from the *Origin of Pagan Idolatry*, 70, 71, 158, 166.
- Foothold constructed for the Science of Tradition, 105.
- Fornander, Mr. M. A., on ancient Hawaiian legends, 62; extract from his *Origin and Migration of the Polynesian Race*, 99.
- GARNIER, Père Julian, quoted by Lafiteau, 96.
- Gaume (Abbé), Monsignor, 139, 140.
- German speculation, Effects of, 38.
- Gentile tradition; Dr. Sepp's summary of his examination of the vast body of, 142.
- Gill's, Rev. W. Wyatt. *Songs and Myths of the Pacific*, 45, 46.
- Gladstone, M., on the true equivalent of Até, 56.
- Goguet on Eastern names for signs of the Zodiac, 93; value of his *Dissertation on the Names and Figures of the Constellations*, 94.
- Goldziher, Mr., on Sun-gods, 14.
- Gothic cosmogony, Curious points in the, 159.
- Great Pyramid, 89.
- Greeks, Symbols of, 94.
- Guess against guess, 108.
- HAM and Chus, 20.
- Hawaiian table of months, Curious fact in, 99.
- Heartless scepticism of our times, 143, 144.
- Heeren's works, referred to, 161, 162; his theory of 'the Sacred Ship,' 170.
- Herodotus on the wives of the early Ionians, 61.
- Hesiod, resemblances to Genesis, 11.
- Hindoo tradition, 67, 68.
- Human race, the science of its story, 34.
- Huxley, Professor, on Topsy's notion, 33.
- INDEFINITE duration, Objections to the theory of, 127.
- Infidel spirit, Growth of the, 143.
- Invention and idealisation of the Zodiacal signs, 104.
- Investigation, Importance of the present line of, 122.
- Iroquois, legend of the Creation, 54, 55; astronomical knowledge of, 96, 96.
- Irving, Washington, on Haytian tradition of the Deluge, 175.
- Izdubar, Identity of, with Nimrod, 13; theory of the Sun-god, 14; prowess of, 20.
- JACOB, Christ foretold by the patriarch, 119.
- Jowett's Plato, remark by Rev. Joseph Rickaby, M.A., 9.
- KOTZEBUE, Remarkable passage from, 52; on the term Moral, 179.

- LAFITAU, Père, Iroquois legend of the Creation, 54, 55; extract from his rare work, 96.
 Lassaulx, Ernst von, 138, 139.
 Latham, Note on the Goddess Isis, 165.
 Lenormant's fragments of Berosus, 70; agrees with Wilford as to resemblance in 'Morai' to 'Meroë,' 179.
 Lesson taught by ancient Rome, 121.
 Lindsay, Earl of, Letter, 9.
 Lituus or crooked staff, one of the symbols of Ammon, also of Osiris, 172.
 Logical aspect of tradition, 33.
 Lucian, 11.
 Luken, M. Henri, *Les Traditions de l'Humanité*, 8, 33, 39, 44.
 Luken's analysis of the traditions of the first man, 44.
 Lyell's conclusions, 149.
- MAINE, Sir Henry, Reference to his *Ancient Law*, 110.
 Malthusian doctrines, 153.
 Mangaian, Legend of the Creation amongst the, 46.
 Maori name for the stars in Orion's belt, 91.
 Mani legend concerning the Tahitans, 100.
 Maurice, F. D., M.A., Passage from the *Religions of the World in Relation to Christianity*, 144.
 Meroë, Ancient state of, 161.
 Meroë, The island of, and the Indian legend of Meru, 163, 164.
 Milky Way, The various names for, 97.
 Mivart, St. George, 18, 41.
 Modern theories, Three: their weakness exposed, 105.
 Monumental revelations, Deductions from, 169.
 Mortimer Collins, Humorous quotation from, 43.
 Moseley, Mr. H. N., extracts from his journal, *Notes by a Naturalist on the Challenger*, 156.
 Moses, The historical books of, curious and unscientific method of ignoring, 110.
 Müller, Professor Max: His preface to Gill's *Songs and Myths of the Pacific*, 45-49, 57; his *Science of Religion*, 62; strictures on his conjectures, 64, 65; his philological conclusions, 80; tendency of his theories, 127; particular side of his philosophy, 128.
 Mutiny of the Bounty, 58.
- Mythical character of two chronologies, 22.
 Mythological disguises, Theory of, 78.
 New Zealand names of the first parent, 53.
 Newman's, Dr., Inaugural discourse, Reference to, 90.
 Neo-philosophers and naturalists, their position on the Progressionist question, 25.
Nigra sed Formosa, Striking passage in, 26.
 Nimrod and Izdubar, Identity of, 13.
 'Old Chronicle' and Berosus' list in juxtaposition, 22.
 Oral tradition, Points to be kept in view concerning, 57.
 Osiris, Typhon in connection with, 168.
 Otaheitan tradition, The argument from, 60.
 Otaheite, Conspicuous religious edifice in, 177.
 Ovid's *Metamorphoses* in apposition to Genesis, 11.
- PAGAN nations, Body of tradition among, 9.
 Palmer's, Mr. William, scriptural synchronism, 8; chronologies of Babylon and Egypt, 22; passage from his *Egyptian Chronicles*, 167.
 Philological mythologists, Modern school of, 30.
 Pictures as records, 109.
 Pitcairn's Island, Community at, 61.
 Plato, Jowett's, 9.
 Plutarch, 11.
 Polynesian tradition, Max Müller and Ellis, 49.
 Position assumed for a Science of Tradition, 132-135.
 Preadamite man, Theory of, 42.
 Precautionary measures desirable, 125.
 Pretended science, how it is to be met, 124.
 Primeval history, the events of a common heritage, 18.
 Primeval revelation, 79.
 Proctor, Mr. R. A., on the constellations, 87; his theory of the constellations, 101-103; his difficulty as to the date of exact astronomy, 108.
 Profane and biblical history, Agreement between, 86.

- Progressionists, The chronological argument addressed to, 7.
 Progressive advance of man to civilization, 25.
 Prometheus, Lassaulx's treatise upon the legend of, 141.
 Ptah, the Egyptian supreme god, 78.
 RAWLINSON, Canon, remark on literal historical interpretation, 21.
 Rawlinson, Rev. G., agreement between profane and biblical history, 86.
 Reading, Discursive, a source of intellectual weakness, 32.
 Reason, Surrender of, to fancy, 111.
 Rickaby, Rev. J., 9.
 SACRED Ship, the, Heeren's theory of, 170.
 Salford, The Bishop of, on the descent of the Foulahs, 156.
 Scandinavian poems and Mexican traditions, The argument from, 77.
 Scepticism, The heartless, of our times, 143.
 Science guided by sound philosophy the true corrective of intellectual aberrations, 112.
 Science of Tradition, Position assumed for, 132-5.
 Scientific magnates, Suggestion to, 41.
 Scientific unbelief, how met, 120.
 Scientists, their imaginative guesses, 107; valuation of, 129.
 Sepp, Dr. Johann, 138; work of, referred to, 9.
 Ship worship in Egyptian temples, 171, 172.
 Singular illustrations of the decay of skill, 37.
 Smith, Mr. George, on the tradition of Berossus and the Izdubar legends, 13; on Izdubar (*Chaldean Account of Genesis*), 20, 21; his conviction concerning phonetic rendering, 35; on the name of Adam, 65; text of Chaldean tablet, 69; reference to the celebrated eleventh tablet, 73; transcripts of tablets, 85.
 Smith, Rev. W., *The Pentateuch*, 15.
 Socialism, its growth in Germany, 38.
 Sothic cycle, 22.
 Southern pole, Vacant space round the, 89.
 Specialists, The dangers of, 31.
 Spencer's, Mr., *Principles of Biology*, Reference to, 111.
 Stanley, Mr. H. M., Extract from his letters from Ugit, 173, 174.
 Stellar period according with epoch of the Dispersion, 88.
 Sun-gods, Numerous and fanciful, 35.
 TAYLOR's *New Zealand*, reference to principal Maori constellation, 91.
 Temple of Infidel Science, The demi-gods of the, 136.
 Temptation of man, the original cropping up again, 130.
 Tezoucans, their oral traditions, 76, 77.
 Thebaud, Rev. Aug. J., S.J., 18, 67, 152.
 Theory of progress, The, 83.
 Thompson, Professor Allen, his presidential address, 40.
 Thought, Coincidences of, 9.
 'Tien' of the Chinese, 81.
 Tower of Babel, The building of the, 84.
 Tristram's, Canon, paper at Church Congress, 19.
 Tradition, Subject of, bibliographical note, 18.
 Tradition, a science with its own special scope and methods, 28.
 Tradition of the nations. Distinguished writers on the, 129.
 Tradition, importance of its testimony as a barrier against anarchy and Socialism, 38.
 Traditions of the Deluge, reduction to scientific groups, 16, 17.
 Traditions of the human race, their scientific reduction, 36.
 Traditions of the first man, Luken's analysis, 44.
 Typhon, in connection with Osiris, 168.
 UNSCIENTIFIC confidence, 29.
 VATHA, in the Mangaian song of the Creation, 66.
 WAJIMI, Tribe of the, 173.
 Weld, Mr. Charles, 82.
Westminster Gazette, Mr. Ryley's criticism in, 7.
 Wilford's, Colonel, view of Hindoo mythology, 160; on conical or pyramidal structures, 176.
 Wilkinson, Sir G., on the Egyptian detestation for the number 17, 167.
 Wood's *Yachting Cruise in the South Seas*, 37.
 ZODIACAL figures, The, probably held in common by several nations, 93.
 Zodiacal temples, where are they? 102.

